

CHURCH HISTORY

DECEMBER, 1937

**Ecclesiastical Provisions for the Support of
Students in the Thirteenth Century**

Frank Pagani

**A Secret Papal Brief on Tyrannicide
During the Counter-Reformation**

Guenter Lewy

**Church and State in the Maryland
Ordinance of 1639**

Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S. J.

**Laisses-Faire or Government Control:
A Problem for John Wesley**

Robert M. Kingdon

The Sacraments in Early American Methodism

Paul S. Sanders



Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1886; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1957

H. Shelton Smith	President	Robert S. Michaelsen	Asst. Sec.
George H. Williams	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. H. Nichols	Editor
(Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York)		Frederick A. Norwood	

OTHER VOTING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Sandford Fleming	Quirinus Breen
Sidney E. Mead	Robert T. Handy
Carl E. Schneider	Jerald C. Brauer
Leonard J. Trinterud	Harold J. Grimm

ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	Roland H. Bainton
William Walker Rockwell	E. R. Hardy, Jr.
Winfred E. Garrison	Harold S. Bender
William Warren Sweet	Percy V. Norwood
Conrad H. Moehlmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Loetscher	Matthew Spinka
John T. McNeill	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Panck	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Massey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petry

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in *CHURCH HISTORY* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *CHURCH HISTORY*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berne, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berne, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (<i>Divinity School, Yale University</i>)	RAY C. PETRY (<i>Divinity School, Duke University</i>)
R. PIERCE BEAVER (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	MATTHEW SPINKA (<i>Hartford Theological Seminary</i>)
ROBERT GRANT (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	WILHELM PAUCK (<i>Union Theological Seminary</i>)
WINTHROP S. HUDSON (<i>Colgate-Rochester Divinity School</i>)	JOHN DILLENBERGER (<i>Divinity School, Harvard University</i>)
SIDNEY E. MEAD (<i>Meadville Theological School</i>)	EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (<i>Princeton Theological Seminary</i>)

VOL. XXVI

DECEMBER, 1957

No. 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ECCLESIASTICAL PROVISIONS FOR THE SUPPORT OF STUDENTS IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY <i>Frank Pegues</i>	307
A SECRET PAPAL BRIEF ON TYRANNICIDE DURING THE COUNTERREFORMATION <i>Gunter Lewy</i>	319
CHURCH AND STATE IN THE MARYLAND ORDINANCE OF 1639 <i>Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S. J.</i>	325
LAISSEZ-FAIRE OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL: A PROBLEM FOR JOHN WESLEY <i>Robert M. Kingdon</i>	342
THE SACRAMENTS IN EARLY AMERICAN METHODISM <i>Paul S. Sanders</i>	355
SURVEY: AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY: A PROGRESS REPORT ON RESEARCH AND STUDY	372
DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS	381

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

384

- RIEDINGER, UTTO: *Die Heilige Schrift im Kampf der griechischen Kirche gegen die Astrologie* R. M. Grant
- DÖRRIES, HERMANN: *De Spiritu Sancto, Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas* Roland H. Bainton
- TELFER, WILLIAM, ed.: *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesis of Emesa* H. Boone Porter, Jr.
- THOMSON, S. HARRISON, ed.: *Magistri Johannis Hus Tractatus de ecclesia* Howard Kaminsky
- SETTON, KENNETH M.: *The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance* Roland H. Bainton
- HARBISON, E. HARRIS: *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation* Quirinus Breen
- VERDUIN, LEONARD, tr., WENGER, JOHN CHRISTIAN, ed., BENDER, HAROLD S. (biography): *The Complete Works of Menno Simons (c. 1495-1561)* Cornelius Krahn
- HÖSS, IRMGARD: *Georg Spalatin: Ein Leben in der Zeit des Humanismus und der Reformation* Clyde Manschreck
- SYKES, NORMAN: *Old Priest and New Presbyter* Theodore O. Wedel
- BEYREUTHER, ERICH: *August Hermann Francke, 1663-1727, Zeuge des lebendigen Gottes* E. Theodore Bachmann
- BALLEINE, G. R.: *Past Finding Out: the Tragic Story of Joanna Southcott and Her Successors* Winthrop S. Hudson
- WARREN, AUSTIN: *New England Saints* Amos N. Wilder
- FORSTER, WALTER O.: *Zion on the Mississippi. The Settlement of the Lutherans in Missouri 1839-1841* E. Theodore Bachmann
- FOSTER, CHARLES H.: *The Rungless Ladder. Harriet Beecher Stowe and New England Puritanism* Perry Miller
- STONE, BARTON WARREN: *History of the Christian Church in the West* W. B. Blakemore
- CLARK, ROBERT D.: *The Life of Matthew Simpson* Richard Cameron
- CARTER, PAUL A.: *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel* Sidney E. Mead
- FOSDICK, HARRY EMERSON: *The Living of These Days: An Autobiography* Paul A. Carter
- CAMPBELL, JOSEPH, ed.: *The Mysteries—Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks, Vol. 2.* Joseph M. Kitagawa

ECCLESIASTICAL PROVISIONS FOR THE SUPPORT OF STUDENTS IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

FRANK PEGUES, *Ohio State University*

Those conversant with the history of mediaeval education are generally aware of the fact that clerks studying in a theological faculty were permitted, during the thirteenth century, to enjoy their ecclesiastical rents *in absentia*.¹ The *Super speculam* of Honorius III is often cited as the basis of this practice, although many scholars also know that the custom was in use, on a local scale, before 1219. The present writer does not wish, at the moment, to inquire into the origins of the practice, nor does he intend to offer any new interpretation of Honorius' famous bull. But the fact that literally thousands of young men were so enabled to pursue higher studies deserves further investigation, and the following remarks are directed toward a better definition and explanation of the ecclesiastical provisions—papal, episcopal, and capitular—which supplied, directly and indirectly, financial maintenance to clerks who sought higher education in the thirteenth century.

The provision in *Super speculam*, that students coming to study theology at Paris should receive the income of their ecclesiastical offices for five years, was gradually extended after 1219 to other theological faculties.² Some of the earlier references to Honorius' "constitution" do not, in fact, mention Paris as the required place of academic residence. In 1226, the archbishop and chapter of York were in a quandary over the interpretation of the pertinent clause in *Super speculam*. Were clerks who had taken leave of the chapter to study in a faculty of theology entitled to daily commons in addition to their ecclesiastical rents? This was a practical question which had arisen from the everyday administration of the pope's provision, a problem which had not been foreseen in the original issue of *Super speculam*. Honorius answered negatively, but the important point for our purpose is that Paris was not named in the papal reply although it may have been understood.³ Some seven years later, Gregory IX had occasion to discuss Honorius' bull with the bishop of Dol. A situation had arisen wherein several clerks, beneficed in the diocese and city of Dol, were withdrawing from the business of their churches "on the pretext of the constitution promulgated by Honorius . . . in which he established that those capable of being taught should be sent to the *studium* of a theological faculty . . . so that those teaching . . . and those studying in the same may receive for five years, by license of the Apostolic Seat, the full income of their benefices, contrary cus-

tom notwithstanding."⁴ These clerks quite often wasted their income on frivolous living, while refusing to study theology, and the bishop of Dol was of a mind to abolish completely the non-residence privilege. Once more, however, the important point in Gregory's letter is his failure to name Paris as the logical destiny of students of theology, implying perhaps that scholar clerks might study theology at any one of several places.

The task of broadening and extending the provision of Honorius was left mainly to Innocent IV who, in a series of letters and directives, amplified and clarified the indulgence established by the worthy successor of Innocent III. Within the space of a few months, a rather impressive number of letters, concerning the study of theology, issued from Innocent's chancery while he was resident in Lyon. In early January of 1245, the pontiff extended to all abbots of the Cistercian Order power and authority to effect provisions whereby Cistercian monks would be enabled to leave their cloisters and go to Paris or some other school for the purpose of studying theology. The provisions presumably concerned the receipt of ecclesiastical income while in school. Furthermore, the wording of the letter leaves no doubt that the Cistercians might be better able to pursue their studies in some place other than Paris.⁵ Following hard upon this innovation, Innocent extended the right to prebendal income and non-residence to all Dominicans in Burgundy who undertook the study of theology in their conventual schools in the dioceses of Dijon and Langres—"just as if they were at Paris in that same study." A few months later, this privilege was given to the Franciscans of Burgundy and, in 1249, the minister of the Franciscans in the province of Bologna was informed that all clerks attending the Franciscan conventual schools of theology at Bologna should enjoy the same rights with respect to income and non-residence "which those studying in that same faculty at Paris are known to hold."⁶ During this period, Innocent also conferred the privileges of the *Super speculam* clause upon clerks studying theology at such *studia* as Narbonne, Toulouse and Valencia.⁷

While blanket dispensation from residence was being given to large groups of scholar clerks, the popes, nevertheless, felt compelled to intervene in particular cases in order to guarantee to aspiring students the right to non-residence and receipt of income. Such a condition implies a reluctance on the part of cathedral chapters to comply with or to fulfill the intentions of Honorius III. A situation of this sort arose in 1232 when Gregory was forced to intercede on behalf of the treasurer of St. Martin of Tours. Peter Karlotus had taken, at an undetermined date, an oath to make residence in St. Martin, "*et postmodum Honorius papa eis suas litteras destinasset.*" Whether the

letter sent to the dean and chapter was the *Super speculam* or a personal letter concerning Peter is not known. But the chapter had refused Peter permission to study theology, whereupon Gregory ordered them to relax the oath of residence for five years in this particular case.⁸ The most likely spot in which opposition to non-residence might be found was the diocese of Lincoln, whose bishop, Robert Grosseteste, was strongly insistent on his beneficed clerks personally residing in their churches and offices. In fact, he constantly asked and received papal support in compelling his clerks to residence. But the five-year privilege for theological studies was so prevalent by 1248 that Innocent IV permitted Robert of Napton, rector of Hanewell, to leave his church for the study of theology "according to the constitution of Honorius III," despite the bishop's wishes to the contrary.⁹ Multiple instances of this sort were to be found all over western Europe in the first half of the thirteenth century, and we could be led to suspect that a clerk's chances of obtaining financial support while in school rested almost solely on papal privilege and intervention.¹⁰ This was not the case, for cathedral chapters included, at a rather early date, provisions in their statutes which permitted and encouraged beneficed clerks better to equip themselves by attending school. We may, in fact, see, through an examination of capitular statutes, the original idea and practice which moved the thirteenth-century popes to support non-residence of scholar clerks.

The capitular provision which permitted canons to attend school is best illustrated, in its earlier form, by a decree of the bishop of Paris when he confirmed, in 1205, the statutes of St. Marcel. The statutes in question, therefore, antedate Honorius' *Super speculam* by some fifteen years. The qualifications which a canon of St. Marcel must have before he could pursue higher studies are given in great detail. He must, first of all, fulfill eight months of residence in his church, after which he could seek license from the chapter to go either on pilgrimage or to a place of study. The statute does not state the number of years which the student might spend in the schools, but other pertinent points are made clear. He was permitted to receive his ecclesiastical income, but was held to supply his church with a suitable vicar to whom he gave 20 s. annually, in addition to daily distributions. The chapter was given the power to grant and deny such leaves of absence and also had authority to recall a student canon when they deemed it expedient. If the chapter were accused of abusing its authority in these matters, appeal could be made to the bishop of Paris. The statute contains no mention of the necessity of papal intervention or confirmation.¹¹

Some fifty years later, in 1255, the church of Ste. Marie la Ronde

in Rouen revised its statutes which further illustrate the care given to financial support of students. Three canons of the church were permitted to attend a *studium scholarum clericorum* after they had made a primary residence of eight months in their church. The time spent in school was, in fact, counted as residence once the preliminary eight months had been completed. If these canons, however, chose to make their residence in school, 10 *l. Tur.* were to be deducted from the fruits of each of their prebends. The total sum of money thus subtracted went to the increase of daily distributions received by those canons personally residing in the church.¹² Excepting minor points of difference, the items of student maintenance in Ste. Marie la Ronde were similar to those of St. Marcel. The provisions of the Rouen church were certainly more conservative and restrictive than those of St. Marcel, but they nevertheless testify to the concern for educational opportunities which was prevalent in the churches of western Europe by the middle of the thirteenth century.

This concern for providing clerks with a livelihood while in school was heightened in 1245 when Innocent IV intervened in the matter and called for a standardization of capitular rules affecting this particular subject. Many canonical chapters presumably had installed, in earlier years, procedures for sending their members to places of higher learning. While such procedures undoubtedly varied ever so slightly, one from the other, there is no great evidence to show that the popes felt any necessity for interfering in or controlling the educational provisions of capitular statutes. In any event, the situation had changed by 1245 when Innocent, still resident in Lyon, composed a letter to the archbishops of France. He called their attention to the fact that several churches had not yet established rules governing the absence of their clerks who were in school. Furthermore, such customs and provisions in existence should be regularized and brought into closer conformity with each other. Deploring the laxity and non-enforcement of capitular statutes, the pontiff used the occasion to deliver a scathing indictment of all clerks who abused the study provisions. He accused canons of attending school not because they were interested in intellectual improvement, but rather because they thus received a vacation with pay. Such students cavorted at night, and by day engaged in idle and ignorant discourse without the slightest pretense at studious application. Above all, he ordered the archbishops to see to it that no clerk, in any of the cities and dioceses of their provinces, should henceforth go to school without first securing capitular permission. And finally, Innocent maintained that clerks should be teachable and have a mind for study; their academic progress should be checked periodically and those who had not progressed satisfactorily

should be penalized and denied further permission to attend school.¹³ In fact, "*docibilis*" had occurred in letters concerning education before 1245, and was to appear increasingly as a requisite for obtaining capitular permission to attend school. The word lets us understand clearly that not all clerks were to be given a chance at higher education; non-residence and receipt of prebendal income were privileges to be accorded clerks who had demonstrated to their superiors in the chapter that they had the necessary ability and talent to make residence in school more than a mere waste of time.

The significance of Innocent's letter consists in the era which it inaugurated. What had hitherto been a purely capitular and episcopal matter became a fertile domain for papal interference and control. To understand this new development, we must recognize that clerks were able to undertake higher studies in the thirteenth century under two plans of non-residence—the *Super speculam* of Honorius and the statutory licenses of individual chapters. The evidence seems to indicate that the two plans, before 1245, were not confused with each other, nor were they thought of as one and the same. The attitude continued even after 1245 and into the fourteenth century; the educational permit of the *Super speculam* was given repeated papal confirmations, and cathedral chapters continued to insert educational provisions in their statutes. The difference was, of course, that the pope seemed to desire and to exercise, after 1245, some surveillance of the study clause in capitular statutes; earlier, he appeared content to administer and define the clause created by Honorius in 1219. When Gregory IX, in his letter of 1233 to the bishop of Dol, said, "What has been established for the utility of churches should not be perverted to their detriment," he referred to the five-year permit of Honorius and to its abuse.¹⁴ After 1245, the pope could make the same statement and refer to all ecclesiastical provisions touching education.

The immediate impact of Innocent's order can best be measured by the frequency with which chapter statutes were re-issued, altered and given papal approval in and just after 1245. The bishop of Amiens received papal permission to temper the rigor of his church's statutes in favor of those "*qui in agro studii quaerunt scientiae margaritam*," and the dean of Senlis acquired similar approval of a statute clarifying the position of non-resident scholar clerks.¹⁵ A year later, the archbishop of Rouen sought the pontiff's advice on the problem of canons who, on the pretext of going to school, were leaving Rouen and their ecclesiastical duties without first obtaining permission from the chapter. Innocent offered a straightforward solution when he instructed the archbishop to withhold their prebendal income since only in this way could such clerks be controlled.¹⁶ And the dean and chapter of

Goslar, in the diocese of Hildesheim, bothered to obtain Innocent's approval when they made changes in their statutes affecting scholar canons and the receipt of prebendal income.¹⁷ Much the same conditions obtained under later popes: Alexander IV permitted the chapter of Chalons-sur-Marne to exact a more stringent oath from student clerks concerning recall in times of urgency, and Clement IV passed on an alteration of the statutes drawn by the church of Le Puy in which, among other things, study provisions were included.¹⁸ But while the new period was characterized by papal intervention, there was little coercion or restriction; in most, if not all cases, the initiative of altering or tempering statutes in favor of clerks wishing to study remained with the bishops and chapters. The pope was simply interested in correcting abuses, and the misuse of study provisions was evidently so prevalent by the middle of the thirteenth century that the entire ecclesiastical system of encouraging higher studies was in danger of collapse. To the remedy of that condition Innocent addressed himself in 1245, and in an effective manner.

The long-term influence of the new papal attitude was felt in various ways. Papal surveillance of capitular provisions extended to special cases of interference in order to guarantee the privilege of non-residence to prospective scholars. Innocent IV commanded Azo, provost in the diocese of Milan, to provide John, archpriest of Loueches, with the income from his ecclesiastical office for one year while John studied in a theological faculty.¹⁹ To a provost in the diocese of Tournai, the same pope guaranteed the revenue from his benefice for two years while he remained in school.²⁰ A much clearer instance of papal control of capitular statutes was the case, in 1256, of John of Rumigny, provost of Cambrai. Although he was held by the statutes of the chapter to an annual minimum residence of three months, Alexander IV dispensed with the required residence and gave John license to study theology for four years while receiving the income of his provostship.²¹ Special favor worked in this matter, for John was a papal chaplain. On the other hand, Alexander carefully informed the dean and chapter of Reims that they were not held to give Peter, cantor of their church, his income unless he actually made residence wherever he was engaged in the study of theology.²² John of Camezano, a papal chaplain, was a canon of Exeter; Alexander insured the receipt of his income for seven years while engaged in studies, despite the fact that John had received letters to the contrary from other sources. Similar letters were dispatched to Alexander of Ferentino and the abbot of Westminster ordering that this particular command be carried out.²³ Since all of these cases concerned non-residence, we might suspect that the pope was simply administering *Super speculam*. But the fact

that the five-year provision is noticeably absent in all of the cited instances seems to support the view that these were cases of papal intervention in, and control of, capitular statutes.

The thirteenth century popes were prepared also to go beyond the mere dispensing with residence as a means of encouraging higher studies. They were willing, in several cases, to permit clerks to hold a plurality of prebends or benefices. In doing this, the papacy faced and surmounted a serious obstacle to education which lay in the path of many potential students. A clerk who held a prebend of small value could scarcely hope to take advantage of *Super speculam* or of his chapter's study provisions, if that income did not suffice to support him at a university. Contrary to conciliar statutes, Gregory IX permitted Henry Gray, of the archdiocese of York, to receive income from two benefices so that he could attend school.²⁴ Urban IV in 1263 permitted John Riston to hold four churches in the diocese of Lincoln, and to receive the income from them for five years while he studied theology.²⁵ The total income of the four churches did not exceed 40 *m.*; evidence from other cases points to the conclusion that 30 or 40 *m.* was a decent income for a clerk. For the most part, clerks were not permitted to hold a plurality of offices if the total income exceeded 40 *m.* In granting dispensations to hold in plurality, the popes quite often set aside chapter statutes which forbade such a practice. In 1263 Peter of Anisy was precentor of Sens, a canon of Auxerre, and also a canon of Paris. The statutes of the church of Auxerre stipulated that its canons, having made a first residence in the church, could receive the income of their prebends while in school, provided that they were not aided by another prebend in the city in which they were studying. Such a condition denied Peter the income of his Parisian prebend, since he was studying in the faculty of theology at Paris. Upon the intercession of the dean of Sens, who was probably Peter's patron, Urban permitted the student clerk to receive the income of all three prebends, contrary to any statute, custom, or the oath which Peter had taken as a canon of Auxerre.²⁶ To John of Moncy, the same pope gave essentially the same privilege of enjoying the revenue of his two prebends in Orleans and his canonicate at Paris, contrary to the statutes of Orleans.²⁷ Chapter statutes usually required an oath of new canons that they would proceed, within a certain time, to take priestly orders. Since this provision also stood in the way of aspiring students, the popes quite often saw fit to interfere with capitular regulations and to free canons from this part of their oath, to the end that they were enabled to pursue university studies.²⁸

The *Super speculam*, the study permits in capitular statutes, and the interest of the popes in promoting educational opportunities, all

seem to have been directed toward the study of theology. This fact is generally agreed upon. And the most conservative speculation would state that thousands of students in mediaeval universities were there because of these ecclesiastical provisions. But if so much was done to promote the interests of the church and the study of theology, what then of the other graduate disciplines, canon and civil law, and medicine? What of the basic "undergraduate" liberal arts course? Clerks who undertook theological study would have completed, under normal circumstances, the arts curriculum which was prerequisite to a graduate discipline. While the church undoubtedly preferred its leaders to have theological training, not all clerks were capable or desirous of progressing so far. In place of advanced training in theology, the church wished its clerks to be educated and to have achieved at least the broad training provided by the arts curriculum. Our evidence points invariably to that conclusion. The income of benefices and prebends was given to clerks "*disciplinis scholasticis insistenti*," or "*cupienti disciplinis scholasticis immorari*." We are frequently given to understand that *disciplina scholastica* was simply a general term which was often used to mean a faculty of theology. This distinction is sometimes not made. On the other hand, clerks were often referred to as "*insistenti studio litterarum*." In any event, students were permitted to use the ecclesiastical study clauses to obtain an education in letters; this curriculum was after all preliminary and necessary to study in a faculty of theology.²⁹

Beyond permitting clerks to enjoy ecclesiastical income while engaged in the liberal arts curriculum and in theological studies, the church was willing to encourage the study of canon law. A knowledge of this natural adjunct of theology was regarded as highly desirable for ecclesiastical administrators—deans, provosts, and bishops. Any ambitious young clerk found it profitable for his future career to study canon law, and dispensation for non-residence in such cases was not difficult to obtain. In 1233 Gregory IX granted to Antoninus, clerk of Placentia, the faculty of receiving his prebendal income for five years while he studied canon law.³⁰ And the five-year stipulation implies that the pope was applying the privilege of *Super speculam*. The natural association of theology and canon law is seen in a letter of Innocent IV in 1254, when he indulged a master Nicholas of Moravia the privilege of studying canon law and theology for five years.³¹ Alexander IV permitted Gilbert of Necton, subdeacon and rector in the diocese of Norwich, to study in the same two fields simultaneously, although no specific time was allotted in the latter grant.³² If the study provisions of the thirteenth century could be extended to cover the liberal arts and canon law, why could they not eventually

apply to civil law? There is at least one instance in which this happened. The chapter of St. Mary at Mainz gave license to one of its canons, a certain Arnold, to study canon and civil law for four years. At the end of that period, Arnold expressed a desire to continue his studies. He had impressed his superiors with his excellence in law, and Gregory IX permitted him to pursue his legal studies for three additional years while enjoying the income of his ecclesiastical prebend.⁵³

Whether wide-spread use of the non-residence privilege occurred in the study of civil law or medicine is simply not known. The numerous capitular statutes dealing with the study privileges scarcely ever mention theology as the required field of investigation. When Alexander IV wrote to Reims in 1257 on the matter of compelling student clerks to residence, the initial paragraph of his letter seemed to say that clerks might possibly study in other fields:

To the dean and chapter of Reims. Desiring that the church of God be more abundantly adorned with lettered men and especially with men learned in sacred scripture, so that their learning may shine forth in the temple of God as the sun and moon, dissolving the darkness of error and ignorance, we frequently command their ecclesiastical incomes to be given to those whom we believe to be teachable and to have a mind for studying in the schools and especially in the schools of a theological faculty.⁵⁴

Another piece of evidence, from an earlier date, indicates that clerks were using the non-residence provision to study in fields other than that of theology, and against the wishes of the pope. In 1247, Innocent IV tried to prevent this evident misuse of the study permit. His letter is incomplete because only a calendar of its contents is given in the published register:

Since certain canons of the church of Levroux, claiming to betake themselves to a theological faculty, study principally in other faculties, and receive the fruits of their prebends, the pope concedes authority to the prior of Levroux for recalling them and compelling them, through withdrawal of their income, to make personal residence.⁵⁵

We have dealt thus far with student clerks who held benefices and prebends, and so were able to enjoy the study permits included in *Super speculam* and in capitular statutes. But what of the young clerks who were not fortunate enough to hold ecclesiastical livings? The intense interest of the thirteenth-century popes in the advancement of education showed itself precisely in this area. Several unbeneficed clerks who had the ambition and perseverance to see themselves through a university were later rewarded for their initiative. In 1227, Gregory IX informed the bishop of Toul that he should confer a prebend upon Peter, a clerk of Toul, who had expended much of his personal fortune in the pursuit of university studies.⁵⁶ Henry, a clerk of Padeborn, had

used a large part of his paternal inheritance to see himself through school. Gregory ordered the dean and chapter of Padeborn to give a prebend to Henry and to receive him as a canon.³⁷ Through papal intervention, another clerk was given an altar canonicate in the church of Barcelona because he had not been aided by an ecclesiastical benefice while in school.³⁸ Similar orders were issued by Alexander IV in 1257 on behalf of a clerk of Bayeux who asserted that he had not had the financial support of an ecclesiastical benefice during the time he spent in the schools.³⁹ Another category of students were those still in school who had never received prebends. It should be noted that most students in this group had not become clerks; furthermore, most of these students were Italians and were presumably attending a secular university such as Bologna. They may even have been law students. A final curious note is that all of our evidence on this category comes from the reign of Innocent IV. In any event, the students were invariably referred to as "*scholares*," and expressed the two-fold desire of becoming clerks and receiving prebends.⁴⁰ There was, finally, a small group of clerks who wished to study and had no prebends. At the request of Gregory IX, the abbot of Deutz, in the diocese of Cologne, provided Arnold with a suitable benefice which would enable him to take up university studies.⁴¹ And to John, clerk of Anagni, "*cupientem scholasticis disciplinis insistere*," the same pope ordered a prebend given in the province of Reims.⁴²

By the middle of the thirteenth century, ample financial provisions had been made by popes and bishops to enable clerks to obtain advanced academic training. While the *Super speculam* of Honorius III is a landmark in papal legislation on this matter, we have seen that bishops and deans of cathedral chapters were also concerned with the encouragement of students. Historians have perhaps been overly attentive to Innocent III and Honorius III and their place in mediaeval education. The role of Innocent IV should be examined carefully and in greater detail. A man of tireless energy and almost infinite capacity, and confronted as he was by the problems of his own day, he knew well the importance of university training. The non-residence provision has been our main concern in this study. It was, in fact, the cornerstone of financial support of education by the church; in it can be seen the germinal form of the financial "scholarship." This becomes especially true when the popes gave benefices and prebends to clerks with the obvious and specific intention of affording them the economic means of engaging in studies. The non-residence provision should therefore be traced beyond the thirteenth century. Certain changes were undoubtedly made in its use during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; these changes, when studied, may throw light on the later development of the

university. With respect to the thirteenth century, the study provisions were not only necessary to the growth of the university; they were largely responsible for the vast increase of lettered men who helped to bring European society and culture a little closer to the threshold of the modern world.

1. Professor Gaines Post had occasion, many years ago, to mention non-residence provisions in connection with the salaries paid to masters, in "Masters' Salaries and Student Fees in the Mediaeval Universities," *Speculum*, VII (1932), 181-198. More recently, Professor E. F. Jacob, in the revised edition of his work on the conciliar period, discussed the petitions of clerks for prebends in the fourteenth century (*Essays in the Conciliar Epoch*, Second Edition, 1953). The present study is part of a larger project which the author has underway on the financial support of mediaeval education.
2. The bull itself is to be found in H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (eds.), *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, I, no. 32.
3. *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland. Papal Letters*, I, 114. Hereafter referred to as *Cal. Papal Registers*.
4. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 1454: "... preteritu constitutionis a bone memorie H. papa, predecessore nostro, promulgate, qua statuit ut ab ecclesiarum prelati et capituli ad theologie facultatis studium aliqui docibiles destinentur, ex quibus postmodum copia possit haberi doctorum, consequenter adjecto ut docentes in theologia facultate, dum in scolis docuerint, et studentes in ipsa integre per annos quinque percipiant, de licentia Sedis Apostolice, beneficiorum suorum proventus, contraria consuetudine non obstante." The edition of papal letters used in this essay is, except where otherwise noted, that of the *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*.
5. *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 897: "... duxeris providendum quod aliqui ex monasteriis tui monachis honestis et ad studendum ydoneis Parisius vel alibi ubi melius expedire videbitur commorentur, divine scripture studio sub regulari observantia vacaturi. ..."
6. *Ibid.*, nos. 970 and 1962. For the Franciscans at Bologna, see *Chart. Univ. Parisiensis*, I, no. 185.
7. Post, *op. cit.*, discussed the extension of *Super speculam* to these studia.
8. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 982.
9. *Cal. Papal Registers*, I, 244.
10. An especially notable example of papal interference in a case which concerned the five-year provision is to be found in *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, nos. 1310 and 1548. The provost of Seclin wished to use the *Super speculam* for theological study at Paris. In May, 1233, Gregory wrote to the archdeacon of Arras and to the dean and cantor of Dendermonde and asked them to compel the chapter at Seclin to give such permission to the provost. This letter was apparently not effective. After a lapse of five months, the pope wrote again to the dean and chapter of Seclin and ordered them to give canonical license to the provost so that he could absent himself from the chapter to study theology at Paris.
11. *Chart. Univ. Parisiensis*, I, no. 4.
12. *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, III, 290.
13. The full text of this important letter is given in *Chart. Univ. Parisiensis*, I, no. 145. A scant calendar of the letter is to be found in *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 1366.
14. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 1454: "Nolentes igitur ut quod pro ecclesiarum utilitate statutum est, ad earum dispendium pertrahatur. ..."
15. *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 986 for Amiens, and no. 932 for Senlis.
16. *Ibid.*, no. 1777.
17. *Ibid.*, no. 5080.
18. For Chalons-sur-Marne, see *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no. 1597. Clement's letter to the church of Le Puy is in *Les registres de Clement IV*, no. 648.
19. *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 2162.
20. *Ibid.*, no. 2625.
21. *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no. 1659: "... ut non obstante quod singulis annis per tres menses in dieta ecclesia residentiam facere tenetur, theologico studio per quadriennium insistere valeat, necnon interim percipere praepositurae ac praebendae proventus, quotidianis distributionibus dumtaxat exceptis."
22. *Ibid.*, no. 1830.
23. *Ibid.*, nos. 2209 and 2210.
24. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 3637.
25. *Les registres d'Urban IV*, no. 289: "Eidem indulget ut, cum se cupiat ad theologiae facultatis studium transferre, proventus ecclesiasticos quos obtinet, quotidianis distributionibus dumtaxat exceptis, percipere valeat per quinquennium cum ea integritate cum quas perciperet illos, si in ecclesiis in quibus beneficia ipsa obtinet, personaliter resideret."
26. *Ibid.*, no. 360. The prohibitory clause of Auxerre's statute, restated in Urban's

- letter, runs as follows: "... prebendarum suarum ipsius ecclesie in scolis percipiant eum integritate proventus, nisi forte in loco ubi litterarum studio institerint, beneficium ecclesiasticum fuerint assecuti."
27. *Ibid.*, no. 364.
 28. Examples of such dispensation may be seen in *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 1059; *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 7258; and *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no. 1833.
 29. H. Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, I, 98-100.
 30. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 1600.
 31. *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 7258.
 32. *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no. 1807: "... ut canonici juris et theologie solemniter insistat ..."
 33. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 4567: "... qui, de licentia sui capituli, studio juris canonici et civilis per quadriennium duxerat insistendum, et satis laudabiliter profecerat in eodem, concedit desideranti adhuc eidem studio insudare, facultatem studendi adhuc in jure per triennium et percipiendi per idem tempus proventus suos ecclesiasticos."
 34. *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no. 1830.
 35. *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, no. 3407.
 36. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 126: "Episcopo Tullensi mandat quatenus Petro, clerico Tullensi, qui pro ipsius episcopi negotiis laborando se multis exposuerat periculis, et fere omnia bona sua expenderat insistendo scolasticis disciplinis ..."
 37. *Ibid.*, no. 1182.
 38. *Ibid.*, no. 1287.
 39. *Les registres d'Alexandre IV*, no. 2380: "... qui diu scolasticis disciplinis institit et in eisdem laudabiliter profecisse dicitur, nec est aliquod, ut asserit, ecclesiasticum beneficium assecutus ..."
 40. *Les registres d'Innocent IV*, nos. 2554, 3075, 3152, 3249.
 41. *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, no. 1417: "... quatenus Arnolde scholari, ejusdem Theoderici nepoti, cupienti, sicut asseribat, scholasticis insistere disciplinis, in competentis ecclesiastico beneficio ... provident."
 42. *Ibid.*, no. 3768.

A SECRET PAPAL BRIEF ON TYRANNICIDE DURING THE COUNTERREFORMATION¹

GUENTER LEWY, *Smith College*

A recent article on tyrannicide in an authoritative Catholic reference work states that there exist few official pronouncements of the Church on this controversial subject.² The only ruling on the legitimacy of putting to death a tyrannical ruler mentioned is the highly ambiguous decree of the Council of Constance in 1415. In the interest of greater accuracy and fuller historical knowledge it may be in place to bring to light a secret brief on tyrannicide issued in 1615 by Pope Paul V in which he approved and renewed the decree of Constance. This brief assumes special significance in view of the fact that until then the earlier decree had never been explicitly confirmed by any pope and thus could be considered as not binding. Moreover, the circumstances under which the brief was issued have received inadequate, and sometimes deliberately distorted, treatment that calls for clarification and correction.

We must begin with a brief description of the events leading to the debate on tyrannicide at the Council of Constance. On November 23, 1407 the Duke of Orléans, brother of the King of France, was murdered and his cousin and rival John the Fearless, the Duke of Burgundy, was suspected of complicity in the crime. The deed itself, occurring in an age when political assassination was common practice, would not have caused an uproar, had it not been for the elaborate justification offered by the Doctor of the Sorbonne Jean Petit. In the name of the Duke of Burgundy, this cleric defended the murder as not only devoid of wrongdoing but actually the fulfillment of a duty, that is, part of the Duke's obligations as a faithful vassal of King Charles VI against whom Louis of Orléans was alleged to have plotted.³ Jean Petit's nine theses were condemned by the Council of Paris in 1414 after prolonged debate, and a year later the matter, by now full of political overtones, was brought before the General Council of the Church convened at Constance. The proposition which was finally condemned by that council did not name Jean Petit and was vague in the extreme. The following assertion was declared heretical: "It is lawful and even meritorious for any vassal or subject to kill any tyrant; he may even resort to ambushes, subtle flattery or adulation, may disregard any oath or pact made with the tyrant and need not wait for the opinion or order of any judge."⁴ Powerful political interests at work behind the scenes prevented a more precise verdict.⁵ The sentence

stigmatized pointed to such an accumulation of wickedness that the council's decree appeared to denounce only a particularly odious violation of natural law and left the door open for the continued advocacy of tyrannicide in certain circumstances. Proscribed was the killing of *any* tyrant by *any* vassal without the authorization of *any* judge. This, of course, did not rule out the legitimacy of killing *some* tyrants when undertaken with the approval of *some* judge.

The above interpretation of the decree of Constance on tyrannicide today is shared by practically all Catholic writers.⁶ During the two centuries following the Council of Constance, almost all theologians similarly considered the decree as condemning merely the killing of a lawful prince, who governed tyrannically, but as allowing the assassination of the usurper of political authority.⁷ Outstanding figures like the Dominicans Cardinal Cajetan, Domingo de Soto, Domingo Bañez and the Jesuits Leonard Lessius, Cardinal Toledo, Gregorio de Valentia, Luis Molina maintained that the decree forbade the killing of legitimate kings, who had degenerated into tyranny, but did not prohibit the elimination of a *tyrannus absque titulo* (tyrant without title) who had seized power by force. The proposition that force could be met by force was considered an axiom of natural law; the killing of such a usurper was legitimate when no other means of freeing the commonwealth were available.⁸ Most Catholic theologians also agreed that a king who had fallen into heresy could be deposed by the pope by virtue of his indirect temporal power. This jurisdiction gave the pope the right to sit in judgment on spiritual offenses of lay rulers and, if necessary, the right of absolving their subjects of allegiance. Opinions differed whether such a manifest heretic and deposed ruler could be considered a tyrant without title and therefore the object of a legitimate slaying. The question was of obvious importance during the religious and political struggles of the Reformation and Counterreformation period and provoked heated controversies. Repeatedly now the Church was subjected to secular pressure for an unequivocal condemnation of tyrannicide, a step which until then it had been so careful to avoid.

In 1613, during the course of one of these polemics, the highly esteemed Jesuit philosopher and theologian Francisco Suarez argued that a heretical ruler may be deposed by the pope and that, after sentence has been pronounced, he may be slain as an unlawful ruler and usurper. Once a king has been dethroned by a judge who possesses the necessary authority, Suarez argued, the decree of the Council of Constance no longer applies and such a tyrant can be put to death by any private individual whatsoever, provided the sentence included this penalty.⁹ Pope Paul V had himself encouraged the publication of the work and on September 10, 1613 he praised the book in a

special laudatory brief.¹⁰ In England, on the other hand, James I had it burned by the public executioner, and when the treatise reached the capital of France, the same treatment was decreed for it by the Parlement of Paris on June 26, 1614. Memories of the assassination of Henry IV, for which the writings of the Spanish Jesuit Mariana had been blamed, were still fresh; moreover, the Gallican-dominated Parlement welcomed every occasion for stirring up feelings against the Roman Pontiff and his champions, the Jesuits.¹¹

When Paul V heard of the Parlement's judgment, he angrily threatened to break off relations with France. The papal nuncio Ubalini was ordered to lodge a strong protest against this provocative act with the regent Marie de Medici and to demand the suspension of the condemnatory decree. Prolonged negotiations ensued over the affair, conducted in the main by the French ambassador to the Holy See, the Marquis de Tresnel. The French government, afraid of the anger of Parlement, asked the pope to condemn the doctrine of tyrannicide found in Suarez's book; the pope insisted on suspension first.¹² Finally, it appears, a compromise solution was found. On December 16 the Crown suspended the condemnation of the Parlement and early in 1615 the nuncio delivered into the hands of the Secretary of State M. de Villeroy a papal brief renewing and confirming the decree of the Council of Constance against tyrannicide. The brief, to the great surprise of contemporary observers, was kept secret.¹³ In fact, it did not appear in print until more than one hundred years later. The following is the complete text in my own translation made from an eighteenth century Bullaria.

Pope Paul V.

For a perpetual memorial of the matter.

The care of the Lord's flock, entrusted to our humble care by His abundant divine grace, constrains us always to be indefatigably vigilant and especially in these times of calamity, so that the attempts of devilish cunning may be overcome by our pastoral care, and especially those by which, under the very pretext of a good or permitted deed, he deceives the careless, or covers those who are basically rapacious wolves with sheepskins, and tries to imperil the safety of princes, whereon public tranquillity depends. Against this danger of circumstances, although through ecclesiastical decrees sufficient precautions have been taken, but since the condition of the time and the gravity of the issue demand it, and since our paternal care for Catholic princes requires it, whose well-being we desire with most sincere feelings and ceaselessly request from the Lord, and for whose safety we beseech God as much as we can, we considered that further precautions should be taken.

#1. Therefore, in order that the nefarious and cursed crime of those who do not fear to raise their impious hands against the persons of princes and make an attempt against their well-being because of their devilish presumption be dislodged from the Catholic Church as much as is granted from on high and that every approach to frauds and wild er-

rors be precluded, the declaration, decree and definition of the Council of Constance concerning the killing of tyrants has been set forth in this tenor: "This Holy Synod, desiring with special concern to achieve the extirpation of the errors and heresies gathering strength in various parts of the world, has been gathered for this purpose. It recently learned that some erroneous assertions in faith and good customs, which are scandalous in various ways and which are attempting to subvert the status and order of the entire commonwealth, have been dogmatized, among which this assertion is included: 'It is lawful and even meritorious for any vassal or subject to kill any tyrant; he may even resort to ambushes, subtle flattery or adulation, may disregard any oath or pact made with the tyrant and need not wait for the opinion or order of any judge.' Acting against this error, to rise against and wholly destroy it, this Holy Synod, after mature deliberation, declares, decrees and defines that the said doctrine is erroneous, against the faith and good morals, in and by itself, as it were, heretical, scandalous and opening the door to frauds, deceits, lies, treacheries and perjuries, and rejects and condemns it. Moreover, the Council declares, decrees and defines that those who obstinately maintain this extremely dangerous doctrine are heretics and expects that they be punished according to the laws of the Church."

#2. After mature deliberation and by virtue of our apostolic authority we hereby renew and, as far as necessary, approve and confirm this perpetual Constitution. If any one, however with diabolical daring, should attempt to contravene it, he shall *eo ipso* be considered to have incurred the sentence of anathema.

#3. We also desire that this our Constitution be affixed to the doors of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles and at the edge of Campo dei Fiori so that all be affected, as had they been personally informed. Given in Rome at St. Mary Major, under the Fisherman's Ring, on the 24th day of January 1515, in the tenth year of our Pontificate.¹⁴

When finally printed the brief bore the marginal notation "From the Registry for Secret Briefs" and its existence has largely remained a secret to this day. The brief was not known to Ranke, the most outstanding Protestant writer on the papacy; nor is it mentioned by the Catholic historian Pastor. In fact, the latter in an apparent attempt to point up the forbearance and goodwill of Paul V, hardly does justice to the true state of affairs. "It was due to the Pope's moderation," writes Pastor, "that the painful incident was at last got out of the way, for he declared himself satisfied with a simple suspension of the parliamentary decree."¹⁵ A French Jesuit, who in a very recent monograph based mainly on manuscript sources describes the whole episode in great detail, similarly wants to make the outcome appear as a full-fledged victory for the papacy and fails to drop even a hint of the pope's concession in the bargain finally agreed upon.¹⁶ The existence of the papal pronouncement must have been known to both writers. Pastor's history, as the title page of each volume indicates, is drawn from the secret archives of the Vatican. Moreover, in a footnote to the sentence just quoted he refers to the biography of Suarez by Father Scorraille

and the above cited article by the French historian Rance, both of which mention the brief of Paul V on the pages cited by Pastor.¹⁷ Father Blet similarly refers to Scorraile's work and his article relies heavily on the reports of the nuncio Ubaldini, the very man who delivered the brief in question.

While the motives of Pastor and Father Blet for concealing the papal brief are fairly clear, one can merely speculate about the reasons for the non-publication of the brief in its day. Perhaps, as Father Scorraile suggests, both sides were anxious to forget the whole affair. Perhaps they preferred to let passions cool off without once more reminding the world at large of the very necessity of condemning the doctrine of tyrannicide. Moreover, Marie de Medici was a pious woman with great deference to the Holy See and the Pontiff then occupying it.¹⁸ It is possible that she agreed to spare Paul V the public embarrassment of acknowledging that some Catholics were still teaching this subversive doctrine. To be sure, the pope neither named Suarez in his brief, as the French government had originally demanded, nor did he go beyond affirming the decree of Constance with all its vagueness and its already mentioned loopholes. The extent of his yielding therefore was minimal. Nevertheless, the brief did reveal that there were those within the Church who conspired against the lives of sovereigns, and this disclosure was unlikely to enhance the prestige of the Church's head. Further research may one day tell the entire story. One must hope that it will adhere to more disinterested standards of scholarship than some of the work carried on in this field today.

1. The research for this paper was done while on a fellowship in Political Theory and Legal Philosophy of the Social Science Research Council granted for a study of the political philosophy of Juan de Mariana, S. J.
2. A. Bride, "Tyrannicide," *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, XV (1950), 2011.
3. The proceedings are described by Friedrich Schoenstedt, *Der Tyrannenmord im Spätmittelalter: Studien Zur Geschichte des Tyrannenbegriffes und der Tyrannenmordtheorie insbesondere in Frankreich* (Berlin, 1938), pp. 5-14. See also Alfred Coville, *Jean Petit: La question du tyrannicide au commencement du XVe siècle* (Paris, 1932).
4. Giovanni Domenico Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova, et amplissima collectio*, Vol. XXVII (Venice, 1784), col. 765. Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are mine.
5. On this point see the careful study of Bernhard Bess, "Die Lehre vom Tyrannenmord auf dem Konstanzer Konzil," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXXVI (1916), 1-61.
6. Cf. Bride, *op. cit.*, 2012; Antonio G. Pelaez, "Doctrina Tomista sobre la tiranía política," *La Ciencia Tomista*, XXX (1924), 319; Petrus Diaz, O.P., *De resistentia tyrannidi: Excerpta e thesi . . . Catholicae Universitatis Americae* (Washington, 1941), p. 18.
7. The exception was the Jesuit Juan de Mariana who in his *De rege et regis institutione*, Lib. I, c. vi (Toledo, 1599) challenged the validity of the decree as such since not approved by any pope.
8. The documentation of this point would require a greater amount of space than it is appropriate to take up here. The passages in question are generally known and are not subject to controversy.
9. Francisco Suarez, S. J., *Defensio fidei Catholicae et Apostolicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores*, Lib. VI, c. iv, secs. 14-18.
10. Ludwig von Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Mid-*

- die Ages*, Vol. XXVI, trans. Dom Ernest Graf (London, 1937), p. 27.
11. Victor Martin, *Le Gallicanisme et la réforme Catholique* (Paris, 1919), p. 358.
 12. A-J. Rance, "L'Arret contre Suarez (26 Juin 1614)," *Revue des Questions Historiques*, XXXVII (1885), 603-606.
 13. Baptiste Legrain, *Decade commençant l'histoire du roy Louis XIII* (Paris, 1619), p. 112.
 14. *Bullarium privilegiorum ac diplomatum Romanorum Pontificum amplissima collectio*, Vol. V, part 4, ed. Charles Cocquelines (Rome, 1754), pp. 170-171. The brief is also contained in a later edition of this collection, but otherwise seems never to have been printed at all.
 15. Pastor, *op. cit.*, 28.
 16. Pierre Blet, S. J., "L'Article du Tiers aux Etats Généreaux de 1614." *Revue d' Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, II (1955), 90.
 17. Raoul de Scorraille, S. J., *Francois Suarez de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Paris, 1912), II, 212; Rance, *op. cit.*, 606.
 18. Martin, *op. cit.*, 351.

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE MARYLAND ORDINANCE OF 1639

THOMAS O'BRIEN HANLEY, S. J., *Marquette University*

With justification American historians emphasize the rise of democratic government during the Colonial Period. The will of the colonists to determine their own affairs grew with greater force after their departure from the mother country. Within the colonies themselves they successfully demanded greater liberty in their political institutions.¹ Free representation was strengthened by the plea for free conscience in a common effort to transform the outward political forms which they had left behind in seventeenth century England. In this process new understanding of the State was developing.

Maryland is characterized in this drama as a contributor to religious toleration, a crucial element of the constitutional ideal in which the State is subordinated to the spiritual life of its citizens. A single enactment, the Toleration Act of 1649, has consequently become a landmark in the Colonial Period, of importance both for Maryland and the new nation. It is a detailed and specific pronouncement on the rights of conscience.

As a matter of fact, however, in the words of an eminent historian of Maryland, "The Act of 1649 only formulated the policy which had ruled the province from the very beginning."² The Lords Baltimore, Proprietors of the Province, contributed considerably to the creation of this policy, but the most noteworthy legal action and formulation was achieved by the Maryland Assembly in 1638 and 1639. After a critical struggle with the Proprietor, the assemblymen created a basic set of laws, which was named The Ordinance of 1639.³ Unlike the Toleration Act, this document was not detailed in its reference to toleration, but contained only broad principles concerning the rights of man, the Church and the State. An analysis of this enactment of 1639 and its contemporary context reveals the basis of toleration whose quality is so largely determined by such principles.

What is so striking in the Ordinance of 1639 is that it implies a toleration more extensive and rich than what the Toleration Act of 1649 suggests. By comparison, the latter would seem to be a departure from the policy dictated by the Ordinance. The Toleration Act also seems to suppose principles which are at variance with the foundations of toleration contained in the Ordinance. It is thus that a close consideration of the Ordinance creates an historical problem which is not adequately solved by the accumulated literature on the Toleration

Act of 1649. A step toward a satisfactory solution of this problem is possible by a study of the Ordinance of 1639; (which is helped by the fact that the assembly of that year possessed a homogeneity of thought not to be found in any great measure in the Assembly of 1649).

I

The members of the first Maryland Assemblies, who formulated the Ordinance of 1639, were souls living in an era of historical transition and politico-religious ferment. Out of this background developed two events in England which directly affected Lord Baltimore and the legislators of 1639. There was the Catholic Remonstrance of Grievances which the English Catholic laity formulated and signed in 1625; better known was Robert Bellarmine's debate with James I over his oath. The first political leaders of Maryland adhered to the party of the Remonstrance and opposed the Oath of James I.

What is the justification for singling out these two instances which concerned only the Catholics of England? It is true that the majority of the Maryland settlers were Protestant. But as one Maryland historian has said, "The physical power was Protestant, the intellectual and moral and political control was Roman Catholic."⁴ One need not attempt to credit exclusively any sect for Maryland toleration, which was, after all, the happy achievement of many elements and circumstances in the colony; notably, a common English political tradition, which antedated the rise of sectarianism, was a profound force. But since the "intellectual and moral and political control was Roman Catholic" in Maryland, this segment of background in England claims primary consideration. It will appear how this factor combined with English political traditions and the simple circumstances of Maryland polity to produce a clearer vision of guiding principles in the realm of Church and State.

What was the intellectual content of this "Roman Catholic control"? It has been said that toleration was not a Catholic, nor an Anglican, nor a Puritan *principle*, though in Maryland it was a *practice*. There is abundant evidence in Europe in the seventeenth century that toleration was not a *practice*. This fact is revolting to our own generation and it might make one hasty in assuming that there was no *principle* of toleration in the residue of Christianity from which all the sects drew their light. To our own purpose here, it can be said that the intellectual content of Maryland's first Assemblies did have such principles from their experiences in England.

We find some of these principles in the Catholic Remonstrance of Grievances of 1625. For a number of years the Catholic Church in

England was deprived of the administrative machinery which was common in Catholic countries. Its re-establishment would have risked severe penalties for Catholics and as a consequence authorities at Rome did not urge English Catholics to press such rights to ecclesiastical functions.

In the years immediately preceding the 1625 Remonstrance, the lack of a bishop was keenly felt. It was at this time that Dr. Richard Smith was sent to England, possessed of the episcopal powers of the See of Chalcedon. Large numbers of the Catholic laity, however justified, became fearful that the prelate would proceed to organize tribunals and other ecclesiastical features such as would be found in Catholic countries. It was in this situation that the Remonstrance of Grievances was drawn up and signed by more than three hundred of the laity, among whom was George Calvert.

The Remonstrance forcefully states what might be expected from a hostile government should any change be made in the present *modus vivendi*. The problem that then remains for the laymen is to justify theologically their acquiescence in the present Church-State arrangement. In proceeding to this they declare their orthodoxy and obedience. They profess the right of the Church to tribunals, legislation for marriage and other matters of a mixed temporal and spiritual nature. The fact of these rights is a matter of dogma. The precise manner in which they are respected in time and place is something else again. The latter is disciplinary, not dogmatic, and can be adjusted with the different temporal authorities involved. The Remonstrance itself expresses this line of reasoning as follows:

Controversies of this kind appeal to a mixed power, being partly temporal over our property and fortunes; and, as such, this authority has by our laws and statutes been made the subject, in varying circumstances, of various ordinances, confirmations, and alterations, no less in the reigns of Catholic than of Protestant kings, as seemed expedient in the eyes of ecclesiastical and political powers here.⁵

We find a more radical discussion of Church-State principles in Robert Bellarmine's writings against the Oath of James I and the Divine Right rationale. As Luigi Sturzo says, Bellarmine "brought back under discussion two acute problems that had never found solution either in the minds of jurists or in popular consciousness—that of the international unity of Christendom and that of the supremacy of the Pope over civil power."⁶

The starting point of Bellarmine's thinking was the ancient Gelasian formula of two distinct powers. "The Christian Republic," he wrote, "was instituted by Christ; its purpose is the attainment of eternal life; its laws are God-given; its magistrates are bishops and the pope; and the rites by which it is bound together are the seven

Sacraments. The civil State, on the other hand, took its origin from human agreement; its purpose is temporal peace; its laws are the creation of human reason, and vary according to circumstances"⁷

Heartening to those who sought toleration were the conclusions which Bellarmine drew from these premises on the nature of Church and State. "Since," he explained, "this great distinction divides the two Republics, your Majesty's prudence will tell you that, in Christian Kingdoms, the civil ruler has authority over his subjects in their civil capacity, but not in their capacity as *cives sanctorum* and *domestici Dei* (fellows with saints and those of God's household); while, on the other hand, the ecclesiastical rulers have authority over the same men in their character as Christians, but not in their character as citizens."⁸ The most important factor which complicated the historical condition in which Bellarmine had to discuss his problem was the international unity of Christendom in which a spiritual power, the Pope, had through medieval times come to play a leading role. The national states had not yet developed the momentum which was to stun Europe and displace from her mental construct this medieval notion of unity. As John Courtney Murray has observed: "The principles could only with difficulty be seen in their clarity and purity; indeed it may be said that their clarity and purity never appeared in any act because every act had a context that tended to obscure its inspiration."⁹ By coming to the New World, the Marylanders were able to escape the major source of these obscurities.

From the standpoint of English political thought, Bellarmine's formulation of the nature of the State was of importance, particularly among the Catholic population. In essence he had declared for a State which was integral; he was able to justify a society and its civil State which "took its origin from human agreement." In vindicating the power of common consent of a people against a king, he does more than appeal to the mediation of Christendom and its spiritual head. He categorically denies on the grounds of natural law the divine right theory and tells James that as a sovereign of the people he can be deposed by them.

Such reasoning as this on the nature of the State has no affinity with that Puritan view which calls the godly to rule the corrupt masses; nor the Hobbesian policeman who must deal with a social organism which is unreasonable and recalcitrant by nature. At the same time, Bellarmine had averted any secularistic interpretations which might have been read into his view of the State as a healthy, functional whole. By reckoning with the historical fact of a universal Christendom, he established the primacy of man's spiritual life over his political existence and led one to accept the fact of a middle zone of mixed spiritual

and temporal matters, a thing congenial to man's spirit-matter reality. Affinities with Bellarmine, as well as the Remonstrance, in these matters are evident in the Ordinance.

II

In the late days of feudal England, there was a common saying, "What the King was without, the Bishop of Durham is within." The Palatinate of Durham in the North of England had extended beyond the Tyne since medieval times and as a remote province possessed unique autonomy which it had not lost by the time of Henry VIII. The principality served as a model for the proprietary colonies which the King of England established in North America. Durham had in time become more subject to the crown but a unique clause in the Maryland Charter provided that this colony should possess all privileges which Durham had "heretofore ever enjoyed."

Explanation of this breadth of autonomy is found in the intentions of those who formulated the Charter. As Charles M. Andrews says of Baltimore: "He was under the impelling influence of motives and obligations that were more imperative than those of a mere colonizer—among which was the sacred duty of finding a refuge for his Roman Catholic brethren, an obligation which had been felt by the Arundel group for many years."¹⁰ Respect for this purpose was not wanting in King Charles, who in accepting a Charter providing such broad freedom of growth was granting something more than commercial benefits to a friend.

"With the assent and approbation of the freemen," is a clause that recurs as a dominant theme in the background of the Charter, as the way is opened to the creative growth of new laws, greatly freed by Durham privileges from obligation to those of England. In an age of political ferment in England, with Parliament striving to broaden its age-old privileges, the Maryland counterpart of this spirit would in its Assembly even more boldly expand the activity of self-government.¹¹ It was to all this that the bent for religious freedom in Baltimore and the Arundel group was to lead.

Against this general outline of the Maryland government in the Charter, Maryland clearly approximates what can be defined as a quasi-sovereign state. The concept of the State as we have been discussing it has adequate meaning in reference to the colony, since Maryland possessed a political unity and institutions suitable for procuring the common temporal good according to the classic definition, a perfect and integral society. Consequently we can speak of the nature of the State as understood by the Marylanders and that of the Church as indicated in the relationships which they came to recognize in the State.

English law has been characteristically capable of broad interpretation and application. In the case of the Charter, which was in the tradition of English law in this respect, the advantages of this fact were important to the colonists. The general references to rights of Englishmen were thus capable of broad extension, ultimately to the fulfillment of religious toleration in Maryland. It was the misfortune of the English, particularly of Catholic Englishmen, that Elizabeth had in her own terms fixed the meaning of these rights in reference to toleration. In the Charter no explicit mention was made of toleration for Catholics, but it was clearly implied, however, in the general rights of Englishmen and of Christians, which were mentioned. These elements of the Charter together with the privileges of Durham which the colony possessed combined to give Maryland the privilege of rejecting the Statute Laws of Elizabeth and their misrepresentation of English tradition.

Aside from the roots of toleration to be found in the rights of Englishmen as Englishmen, we find a passage which treats of religion as an institution, explicitly the Christian religion. In it Baltimore's power to interpret the Charter favorably to himself is granted, but "provided always that no interpretation is made by which God's true and holy Christian religion . . . would suffer any prejudice diminution or curtailment."¹² There is a tradition here from the principle of liberty of the human person to that of the religious institution; the personal entity as distinct from the moral entity which embodied many persons. In the Charter's passage this unity is recognizably integral from the State's viewpoint, and its function and subsequent growth beyond the power of the State to control.

"God's true and holy Christian religion," as a Charter term, creates considerable ambiguity. To some it would seem to imply only the official Church of England. In that case it would not necessarily follow that an identical reproduction in Maryland of the Church-State arrangement in England was demanded by the Charter.¹³ Apparently the privileges of Durham would free the Maryland government from this obligation. Others would argue that the privileges of Durham gave Baltimore the power to establish the Roman Church, since the generic term, "Christian Religion," included this possibility.¹⁴ It would not be realistic to attach either explanation to the intention of Baltimore and Charles. If a passage in the Charter conclusively held the possibility of establishment as it existed in England, Maryland would hardly offer a solid hope for those who were dissatisfied with conditions in the mother country, and from whom Baltimore intended to draw the nucleus of his colonial settlement. On the other hand, it was inconceivable that establishment of Catholicism was hoped for in the face of a

numerically Protestant population in Maryland, and under grant from a ruler in opposition to Rome. Understanding all these aspects Baltimore, as well as the King, shrewdly and in the spirit of English law, did not attempt to resolve such circumstances of the Charter. The result was as George Petrie concludes in his monograph: "Historical forces were at work, and these, in connection with the policy of the administration and the temper of the colonists, were, after all, to determine the relation of Church and State in Maryland."¹⁵

Lord Baltimore's own writings and actions are a valid source of commentary on the Charter which was formulated by him. There is, first of all, little doubt that Calvert understood the powers which the privileges of Durham gave him. Baltimore's jealous rivals in Virginia were quick to protest. Governor Pott and others, in a statement to the Royal Government, made specific reference to the singular extension of the Durham rights: "There is intended to be granted the Liberties of a County Palantine and there is noe exception of Writts of Error, or of the last appeale to the King as by law ought to bee." The protest then attacked the key phrase in the Charter which removes possibility of the usual limitations of these liberties—"prout aliquis Episcopus Dunelmensis infra et unquam entehac habuit vel habere potuit (insofar as any Bishop of Durham thus far ever held or could have held)." The Virginians thought that this was "to Genrall and incerteine because it doth not name any one certeine Bishop of Durham to whom it may referr; and the County Palantine of Durham was altered 27.H.i.c.24 that the Justices must be made in the King's name and by his authority."¹⁶

The King referred these complaints to the Privy Council. Its report agreed with the Virginia group, criticizing categorically the "Royall and Imperiall Power which is granted in all things of Sovraignty saying only allegiance to the Kings Majestie . . ." Among other departures from the practices of England, the Council decried, "the power of giving Honors, Lands, Priviledges and other Franchises to such as shall take of him." The end result would be "to people his (colony) with persons of all sorts whatsoever different from the other Colonies in Religion Assertion or otherwise." Such a colony "haveinge power in themselves to manage their affaires free from all dependency on others" presents a temptation to colonists from Virginia and creates a "very dangerous" condition.¹⁷ When the King left the Charter unchanged in the face of these criticisms, he made it clear that Maryland was not compelled to the system of law which governed his subjects in England and in the other colonies of America.

A further matter of significance regarding the King is found in the liberty which he gave the Marylanders in taking the oath of alleg-

iance. Before the colony was ever proposed Charles had personal experience of the attitude of George Calvert and in the situation did not urge him to the oath which was in current practice, but, on the contrary, expressed admiration for Calvert's courage and honesty as a recusant.¹⁸ Calvert was but reflecting a conviction which had persisted among the Catholics of England in the wake of Bellarmine's conflict with James I over the oath. When the planting of the Maryland settlement was under way, Charles respected the mind of these recusants and permitted them to modify the oath in keeping with their consciences. As a consequence, the nature of monarchy possessed a different, non-Stuart construct in the minds of the Marylanders.

The framers of the Maryland Charter managed to keep their purposes a secret until the document had received its seal. Then they openly affirmed that the document was correctly understood regarding the liberty granted in Maryland. Something of an official *apologia* for the Charter was formulated under the title, *Objections Answered*. It seems that among Baltimore's advisers Andrew White, the missionary, was largely responsible for this tract, which was a popular approach to the very profound problem of principles involved in Church-State matters.

One commonly urged objection was the "sin of permission," of which the Massachusetts Bay Puritans were to make so much. If Marylanders were put outside the discipline of English laws touching religious practice, the Royal Government would be "permitting" the spread of heresy and would be relinquishing that charitable concern for the citizen's soul which is a ruler's most sublime responsibility. To this *Objections Answered* moderately responds: "Conversion in matter of Religion, if it bee forced, should give little satisfaction to a wise State of the fidelity of such convertites, for those who for worldly respect will breake their faith with God doubtless will do it, upon a fit occasion, much sooner with men."¹⁹

In dealing with another objection, the author reveals how the Maryland project clearly departed from European Church-State arrangements. The charge was similar to the one found in the Virginia appeal to the King against the Maryland Charter. "The said Roman Catholiques," reads *Objections Answered*, "will bring in the Spaniards or some other forraigne enemy to suppress the Protestants of those parts, or perhaps grow strong enough to doe it themselves..."²⁰ The immediate answer to such an objection was the *reductio ad absurdum* which followed from a realistic statement of circumstances in the New World and the projected colony.

More fundamentally, however, the objection rested on the common belief of the time that religious uniformity was essential to the

well-being of the State, and, many would say, of the Church. The Marylanders, however they were able to couch their answer, must deny this principle; for the government they planted in America could not be justified in terms of national states and national religions. Religious dissent among Protestants was rising fast in the 1620's in England and when the Marylanders questioned the rigors of religious conformity, a hearing was in reach. From this standpoint the Maryland government was truly an experiment in new foundations and structure. Its principles were a European heritage, but a more ancient one, one washed by an ocean voyage of the tarnish which in Europe obscured its meaning.

III.

The broad and often ambiguous terms of the Charter took on more precise meaning in the minds of the first Maryland political leaders. The first Assemblies in Maryland unfold in their records some fundamental notions of the State which were expressed by Bellarmine. The legislative activities of the Marylanders leave no doubt that they believed that civil authority derived from God and that its repository was not a royal bosom, as James had said, but the people. The vital force which such a premise gave to representative government was striking in the first Assemblies. It led to disagreement with Baltimore.

Without explicit order from Lord Baltimore, the first Maryland Assembly convoked in 1635. The assemblymen did not delay in formulating certain laws by which they intended the colony should be governed. The Proprietor immediately took aggressive measures to resist their action. Baltimore denied that the Charter gave the assemblymen authority to initiate legislation. By the time the 1637 Assembly had convened, Baltimore had made his own Code of Laws, on the presumption that the Assembly would consent to them.

The assemblymen did not admit that the Proprietor alone had the power to initiate legislation nor that Baltimore's Code was suitable. From several standpoints, Baltimore did not deem it advisable to continue opposition to the assemblymen. He first tried to win a reconsideration of his Code; and, when this failed, he sought revisions and compromises in its wording. The latter attempt likewise failed and the Proprietor was forced to see the assemblymen proceed to formulate their own set of laws. They were more definitive than the earlier legislation and were entitled the Ordinance of 1639.

Thus it is that the Code of Baltimore, as external evidence, gives us a better understanding of the much briefer formulation of 1639. It would not be correct to say that all that was rejected of the Code was

denied in principle by the assemblymen. Instances of substitution under a specific topic, however, do offer significant evidence. Beyond radical disagreement in some cases, there is the more important modification which reveals a clearer insight into essential principles and their application. It was this latter boon which a viewpoint in the New World had brought about.

In the First Act of the Ordinance of 1639 the spirit of self-government was formulated in the following terms:

All acts and ordinances assented unto and approved by the said house or by the Major part of the Persons assembled and afterward assented unto by the Lieutenant Generall in the name of the said Lord Proprietarie . . . shall be adjudged and established for Laws to all the same force and effect as if the Lord Proprietary and all the freemen of this Province were personally present and did assent to and and approve the same.²¹

This passage of the Ordinance substantially modifies the Code of Baltimore where it touches on the same topic. Baltimore agrees that the Maryland Assembly should have "like power . . . as the house of Commons . . . had used or enjoyed. . . ." To this he also adds the significant phrase, "or of right ought to have use or enjoy." However, in the interest of his own power, he includes strictures on the democratic processes on which the colonists were bent. He wished to hold the power of veto over enactments of the Assembly. "All acts," one passage reads, "shall be of force untill the Lord Proprietarie shall Signifie his disassent to the same. . . ."²² In connection with felonies, unlawful assembly was mentioned and any "exercising within the province any jurisdiction or authority which ought to be derived from the Lord Proprietary without lawful power or commission from or under him." Regarding the liberties of the people, he declared that none shall be imprisoned nor dispossessed except "according to Laws of this province saveing to the Lord Proprietarie and his heirs all his rights and prerogatives by reason of his domination and Seigneiory over this Province and the people of the same."²³ There is little wonder that such legislative proposals were rejected by an Assembly which had heretofore functioned in such free style.

It is noteworthy that the Ordinance did not mention the Statute Laws of England. Baltimore had not only mentioned them but also outlined the order and function of authority in English courts, officials, etc., which were to be the pattern for those in the Colony. Baltimore's directions in his Code generally implied that these English forms were to be followed as nearly as possible. The Maryland Government would be free to depart from them in specific instances, but only by definite legislation which the Assembly would pass. The Ordinance, on the other hand, implied that a specific Statute Law would have to pass the

Assembly before it had force. In brief, the Code of Baltimore tended to impose a detailed pattern for Maryland, whereas the Ordinance left the assemblymen the task of constructing the course of the Colonial Government according to New World conditions, with the broad general norms of English tradition and Common Law only as a point of reference.

One vital root of an Englishman's law was the Magna Carta. From its broad statement of principle, their positive law derived as from a consideration of human nature. Appropriately, then, the Second Act of the Ordinance made explicit reference to this political birthright of Englishmen. "All Inhabitants of this Province shall have all their rights and liberties according to the great Charter of England."²⁴ The assemblymen had avoided a long legal document by presupposing the Maryland Charter; so now they did not enter into a detailed discussion of rights which, after all, must live by a spirit and tradition.

This simplicity again contrasted with Baltimore's Code. He entitled one act "for the liberties of the people," but he limits its force. "Being Christians" entitled them to liberty, slaves were explicitly excluded by a parenthetical reference, and liberties were to be by force of "the common law or Statute Law of England (saveing in such Cases as the same are or may be altered or changed by the Laws and ordinances of this Province)." He does not fail to insist on "his domination and Seigneiory over this Province and the people of the same."²⁵ This Act for the Liberties of the People, as it is entitled in the Code, possessed little authentic relationship to the Magna Carta, as the assemblymen must have been quick to note.

The outline of the notion of the State, as we see upon analysis, begins to emerge from the Ordinance. It was for the people to designate in whom the civil authority, which God created in human society, should be exercised. Under this conviction the Marylanders logically emphasized representative government.

IV

In addition to the origin and exercise of civil authority, we find enlightening considerations on the limitations of civil authority in the Ordinance. Not only in references to the rights of Englishmen as human persons, but in a passage on the ancient rights of the Church as a moral person, we find evidence of clearly conceived principles.

In the simplest terms the Ordinance states that the Church "shall have all her rights and liberties."²⁶ Its wording varies little from what we find on the same topic in Baltimore's Code. The language, in tone

as well as formulation, is in accord with a long line of famous English charters dating back to the Magna Carta. A textual difficulty, however, has given rise to a discussion which has uncovered the deeper significances of the apparently commonplace dictum.

The Act which we find in the Ordinance does not say Holy Church but rather Holy *Churches*. The question arises in the face of an obvious error of the scrivener, must *her* be changed to *their*, or should *Churches* become *Church* in correcting the text, "Holy Churches within this province shall have all her rights and Liberties."²⁷ The textual difficulty is easily resolved because the Maryland Assembly in the year following the Ordinance corrected the phrasing by its own modification of the 1639 Act of the Ordinance. The singular, *Church*, was used in the revision. It would seem that the 1639 scrivener, before being distracted, had in mind the seventeenth century possessive singular of Church, which is *Churches*, evidently intending to couple the word with "rights and Liberties" in a construction with the passive voice.

The reasoning contrary to this which led to positing the plural of Church seems plausible to us today. The assemblymen were trying to adapt the phrasing of the traditional English charters but between the Ordinance and these charters stood the disruption of religious unity with the rise of Protestantism. There was not one Church but many. The legislators intended that Marylanders of whatever faith or church should enjoy the traditional liberties of these charters according to a new adaptation suited to this historic change. All churches should enjoy the rights and liberties accorded the one Church before Henry VIII's break with Rome.

The suppositions, however, are too simple for the early seventeenth century Englishmen, whether in England or America. These people had a living memory of religious unity in Europe from which they were not many years removed. It would be safe to say that each sect believed that there was but one Church. Diversity arose only from disagreement about the outward form of the Church and all were zealously bent upon winning proselytes to their view of what that form should be. To the Anglican, for example, this form meant the proper order of worship (the *Book of Common Prayer*) and the King as head of the Church. It was on all sides a question of dealing with recalcitrants or the heterodox. The legislators seemed to be clearly aware that there were many views about the true nature of the Church, and did not with their terse statement pretend to remove by force of law any of this diversity. The singular, *Church*, was indeed ambiguous, but it was an honest ambiguity.

Where, then, is provision made for freedom of conscience, which

defenders of the plural form have found in this passage on the liberties of the Church? There is an ill-advised supposition in this question; individual freedom is not likely to be found in a passage which purports to deal with freedom of a moral person such as the Church. It is true that freedom of the Church implies and indirectly provides freedom for the member. But such an indirect approach leads to the conclusion that membership in the Church is a requisite for the enjoyment of toleration and freedom of conscience for the individual. Nor is this reasoning faithful to the understandings of Englishmen. According to their tradition freedom of conscience was directly provided for as distinct from those accorded the moral persons such as the Church. This distinction we see in the historic charters and in imitation of these the Ordinance places two separate Acts, one for the rights of the Church and another for those of the people. In the broad provisions of the latter act we should place the right of freedom of conscience of the individual.

Among other changes which the Ordinance made in the Code's Act for the Liberties of the People, was one touching the phrase, "being a Christian." Baltimore proposed "that all the Inhabitants of this Province being Christians (Slaves excepted), Shall have and enjoy all such rights liberties immunities priviledges and free customs within this Province as any naturall born subject of England hath or ought to have."²⁸ The Ordinance dropped all the qualifications which we find in the first part of the Code's passage and added the reference, "according to the Great Charter." It is on such a broad foundation of personal liberty that we must base the toleration which was practiced in the early Maryland.

On the basis of the Ordinance, then, we cannot say that one had to be a Christian in order to enjoy toleration or the religious liberties referred to in this passage. Omission of the phrase, "being Christians," has this force. The Ordinance safely avoided the danger of misinterpretation when it omitted all reference to *Christian*. At the same time it took a firm stand against the oversimplification of the secularist when it gave special reference to the spiritual society, the Church, and to her rights and privileges as a moral entity, distinct from individual persons and their specific rights.

The simplest and clearest evidence of what we are saying here is found in the fact that a Jew was a member of the Assembly a few years after the Ordinance was passed. There is another instance at a later date.²⁹ Such a practice is not legally validated by the ambiguous passages of the Charter and, much less, by the Toleration Act of 1649, which clearly extends its benefits only to Christians. On the basis of written

law, the non-Christians could appeal only to the Ordinance of 1639, and its Act for the Rights of the People.

It is suggestive to find *immunities* added to the general reference to the rights of the Church in Baltimore's Code, and to observe that the term is dropped in the Ordinance's Act for the Liberties of the Church. The feudal structure of medieval times, the national state, these and other European circumstances provided certain privileges by which the Church could exercise her rights and liberties in pursuit of her divine mission. The Church did not need these practices to safeguard her liberty in Maryland. In their new condition and the viewpoint which it provided, the Marylanders were able to see how many of these practices in Europe tended to defeat their purpose of freedom for the Church, and, in other cases, how they degenerated into clerical venality and bureaucracy. Marylanders would seem to have freed themselves of such traditions, especially if they believed that some of these immunities usurped the legitimate function of the State, or obstructed the course of freedom of conscience. At the same time, there is ample evidence from the *Proceedings of the Assembly* that a secularistic view of religion was far from the legislators when they dealt with the specific situations, for example, the right of condemned to access to clergy, or the exemption of clergy from the role of civil negotiators with the Indians.

In contrast with the Marylanders, Baltimore seemed to desire all the consequences of a full-blown, medieval Palatinate. An extremely personal character of feudal authority supposed that the religious life of the individual prince would overflow into his civil offices, thus producing the basic problem of medieval rule out of which grew the dangers of lay-investiture. A vestige of this order of things may be found in the years following the Ordinance, when Lord Baltimore took a direct hand in the replacement and selection of the clergy for ministry in his Palatinate.

The Ordinance differed greatly regarding the religious felonies which we find enumerated in Baltimore's Code. Sacrilege and sorcery are mentioned by him and he states that "it Shall be adjudged felony within this Province to commit Idolatry which is the worshipping a false God or to commit blasphemy which is accursing or wicked speaking of God. . . ." ³⁰ Penalties are severe. In his Act for the Authority of Justices of the Peace, cursing is specifically called to the attention of those who are to execute justice. The whole passage reminds one of the medieval prince who was the personal guardian of his people. Under the pressure of Calvinistic theology, such laws as these found growing support in the England of Calvert's day. The Puritan theory of them,

however, unlike Calvert's, derived less from the notion of feudal government than from the economy of the Chosen People of the Old Testament.

The Ordinance refers to felonies only briefly, and the implication for religious felonies differs greatly from Baltimore's Code. "The Lieutenant Generall or any one of the Councill . . .," it said, "shall or may Command and appoint all power and means necessary or conducive to the apprehending of felons or keeping of the peace. . . ." This does not refer directly to religious felons. Conceivably, blasphemy and other such matters, which Baltimore had designated felonies, could come into court in consequence of this. If blasphemy were such that it disturbed the public peace, then the civil magistrates were empowered to act. They do not decide the nature of sorcery or judge one's guilt of blasphemy. These are essentially spiritual matters of which the Church, a spiritual society, and her ministers are the competent judges. Thus, according to the Ordinance, a religious felony would not be so judged, but, rather, as a breach of public order because of public contempt for the religious beliefs of others.

Happily the Assembly was saving itself and its courts much grief by the approach which it took to felonies. One need only look to the conditions brought on by the opposite course in seventeenth century New England, where civil courts developed a casuistry dealing with many religious topics. In Europe both Protestant and Catholic countries were caught up in similar schemes which invited all the disorders of which fanaticism, bigotry and personal enmity are capable.

In this substantial departure from Baltimore's Code, it should not be supposed that the Maryland government was neutral with regard to the religious life of its citizens. There was no personal patronage of religion such as we find in medieval times and in reflected form in Baltimore's thinking on Maryland. The representative nature of Maryland government precluded this. The distinctness of the two societies, which emerges in such clear lines in the Ordinance, would likewise suggest that this concept of personal patronage was passé. Nevertheless, the Maryland government gave evidence that it hoped to effect one end envisaged by the devout prince, reverence for God as the source and foundation of political life. We have instances of this intention in the Assembly's legislation. Clearly the course to its fulfillment was not in the direct feudal manner which unavoidably confused the temporal and spiritual realms. Instead, the contribution of the State would liberate the Church in pursuit of her spiritual mission and liberalize the view which the State took of mixed matters.

Another passage of Baltimore's Code which the Maryland

Assembly entirely rejected was an oath of allegiance. It differed from that of James, but must have had some questionable clauses which prompted the assemblymen to postpone a final formulation. A partial explanation may be found in the Act of Treason which is closely related to the oath, and which was likewise omitted from the Ordinance. Of the offenses classified as treason we find this: "to . . . adhere to any forreine prince or State being a professed and declared enemy of his Majesties in any practice or attempt against his said majestie."⁸¹ It would seem best to explain Baltimore's position in terms of his general policy, which was to reproduce in his colony the political forms of the mother country, making modifications in favor of religious liberty where he thought that it was endangered. The assemblymen must have remembered the attempts in English history to apply the terms of treason laws to the Pope. When one observes that the practice of informing on the treasonous was included in Baltimore's oath, one can further understand why both topics were untouched by the laconic formulation of the Ordinance.

Laconic speech becomes the forthright assemblymen of Maryland. They were not anxious to multiply ramifications of the few radical principles for which they spoke. They may have volubly spoken with historical hindsight of the gross failures of European governments in discerning and applying those principles. For themselves and their immediate problem of statecraft, however, they seemed to realize full well the very limited clarity with which contemporaries of the historical moment must be content in making their decisions.

This brevity borne of conviction and humility, which we see reflected in the Ordinance of 1639, was blessed by the providential circumstances of the New World. In the remarkable concurrence of events, the Marylanders, as we view them in historical retrospect, demonstrated an impressive mastery of their own historical moment.

1. "It is through a broad and thorough study of this conflict," wrote Herbert Osgood, "that we shall discover the main trend of events within the provinces themselves, and at the same time note the preparation of forces which were largely to occasion the revolt of 1776." Cf. "The Proprietary Province as a Form of Colonial Government, Part I," *American Historical Review*, II (1896-1897), 654.
2. William Hand Brown et al. (eds.), *The Calvert Papers No. 1*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publications No. 18 (Baltimore, 1889), p. 35.
3. In the *Proceedings of the Assembly*, ordinance implies all the force of the term, law, but designates a specific

period of time for which it binds.

4. Bradley T. Johnson, *The Foundation of Maryland and the Origin of the Act Concerning Religion of April 21, 1649*, Maryland Historical Society Fund Publication No. 28 (Baltimore, 1883), 31.
5. In the *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Text* (New York, 1917), I, 204-205, by Thomas Hughes.
6. *Church and State* (New York, 1939), 249-250.
7. Xavier M. La Bachelet (ed.), *Autorium Bellarminianum* (Paris, 1913), 235; the translation followed here is that of James Brodrick, *The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine 1542-1621* (London, 1928), II, 166.

8. *Ibid.*
9. "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power," *Theological Studies*, IX (Dec., 1948), 503.
10. *The Colonial Period of American History* (New Haven, 1937), II, 279; I, 79.
11. Mary P. Clarke, *Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies* (New Haven, 1943).
12. William Hand Browne et al. (eds.), *Archives of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1883—), III, 12; hereafter referred to as *Archives*.
13. George Petrie, *Church and State in Maryland*, Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. X, No. 4 (Baltimore, 1892), p. 11.
14. William King, "Lord Baltimore and His Freedom in Granting Religious Toleration," *American Catholic Historical Society Records*, XXXII (December, 1921), 298.
15. *Church and State in Maryland*, 11-12.
16. *Archives*, III, 18.
17. *Ibid.*, 19.
18. Florentine Ambassador to the Grand Duke of Tuscany; in C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Period*, II, 277-278.
19. Hughes, *op. cit.*, Documents, I, 11.
20. *Ibid.*, 13.
21. *Archives* I, 82.
22. *Ibid.*, 75.
23. *Ibid.*, 41.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, 83.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*, 40.
29. Matthew Page Andrews, *History of Maryland: Province and State* (New York, 1929), 95-96.
30. *Archives*, I, 71-72.
31. *Ibid.*

LAISSEZ-FAIRE OR GOVERNMENT CONTROL: A PROBLEM FOR JOHN WESLEY¹

ROBERT M. KINGDON, *State University of Iowa, Iowa City*

Many students of John Wesley have examined his economic ideas;² few have appreciated their range. At least three sources molded the economic thought of the founder of Methodism. Only one of them, the Christian ethical tradition, has been studied with sufficient care. It was, to be sure, the first and most prominent source. But it was followed, first by Wesley's reaction to certain acute social problems which forced themselves on his attention during the 1770's, then by the thought of one of the most prominent economists of that day, the Rev. Josiah Tucker, Dean of Gloucester. These later stimuli led Wesley to consider a problem which disturbed many of his contemporaries, the problem of the extent to which a government should be allowed to control commerce and industry. His thinking on this problem is important, not because of its sophistication, but because of the tremendous influence Wesley exerted on public opinion, through his uncommonly effective preaching, organizing, and writing.³

The place to begin a fresh analysis of these ideas, however, is probably with their best known source, since it provided a constant element with which the others were mingled. The Christian ethical tradition, as Weber and Tawney have pointed out,⁴ had evolved by Wesley's time to the point where economic activity and evidence of prosperity were no longer regarded as subversive of true religion, but were rather accepted, and, on occasion, even interpreted by some as marks of divine favor. Wesley proved himself abreast of this trend by accepting wholeheartedly several of the ideals of the evolving capitalist society, early in his preaching career. This is most clearly revealed in his sermon *On the Use of Money*, first delivered in the 1740's, printed in the earliest edition of his *Standard Sermons*, used again and again in varying forms down until his death.⁵

The import of this sermon is highly personal and highly religious. It attempts no analysis of the economy as a whole, and recommends no policies for government or society. Wesley's aim here was to reform the business habits of individuals in order to help them in achieving salvation. He did not at this point seek to engineer for them an escape from some social predicament.

Wesley's advice is summed up in three plain rules: "Gain all you can, save all you can, give all you can." With the first rule,

he frankly and openly adopts industry as a Christian virtue, excepting only industry which injures the self or damages our neighbor. With the second rule, Wesley endorses the capitalist virtue of thrift, in the process linking himself with the long chain of Christian preachers who have condemned luxury. With the third rule, he establishes a religious obligation of philanthropy, not explained in detail at this point, but made increasingly meaningful by the extensive charities organized by his followers, both individually and collectively.⁶

The three plain rules were applied in many ways. Perhaps the most dramatic application was provided by Wesley's own career. During his lifetime he earned, largely through the sale of books, prodigious sums of money, perhaps as much as 30,000 pounds. All of it was immediately plowed back into the organization and its charitable activities.⁷

It is easy to see how this ethic strengthened the "spirit of capitalism." The Methodist virtue of industry was of great utility to entrepreneurs looking for masses of men willing to work regular hours, in regular routines, in the highly organized factories that typified the new economy. Work of this sort is hardly natural to the human animal. But Methodists had acquired a new and particularly useful nature when they took this command seriously. This virtue of industry was of utility also in developing managers and executives, particularly since honesty and loyalty accompanied industry in the Methodist canon of values.

The Methodist virtue of thrift was also useful, especially when divorced from the ethic as a whole. Those Methodists and ex-Methodists who retained their habits of industry and frugality, but forgot their obligation to philanthropy, were in an ideal position to accumulate capital. It was just such primitive accumulation of capital that made possible much of the earliest factory building that marked the beginning of the Industrial Revolution.⁸ Wesley did not forbid this. He allowed investment in one's own business as a legitimate expenditure of money,⁹ just as he approved of bequests, providing they were to children who knew how to use money. He did not, however, approve of deposit in banks,¹⁰ perhaps because he did not see the importance of their investing functions.

In every way, therefore, Methodism provided a powerful religious sanction to those very virtues most useful to the building of a capitalist economy. Perhaps Max Weber in his search for the psychological sources of the spirit of capitalism, should have concentrated more on the Methodists and spent less time on the Puritans.¹¹

The second stimulus to Wesley's economic thought was the social environment around him. This is particularly obvious in the 1770's when most of his polemical tracts dealing with social problems were written. A depression, touched off by crop failures, hit England from 1772 to 1775,¹² and upset Wesley greatly. On his evangelical travels he had a chance to see for himself that thousands were out of work and that even those holding jobs were having trouble making ends meet. The most depressing symptom was the rapid rise in the prices of basic foods. This was particularly obvious in communities like Colchester, Bury St. Edmunds, and Chelmsford, where it led to food riots, in which mobs seized quantities of grain, flour, and other foods and sold them for the owner at what they considered to be just prices.¹³ Justices of the peace were urged to stop these riots, but were often too frightened or too tender-hearted. Wesley had once witnessed a riot of this sort, and on that occasion he had even approved of the action of the mob. He had remarked on their "calmness and composure."¹⁴

All over England thinking men tried to explain and find remedy for the distress of the people.¹⁵ Most frequently they blamed the enclosures. Another favorite villain was "the infamous practice of Combination and Forestalling." Many also blamed the export of cattle and grain to France. These men then proposed that the symptoms be attacked directly. The King and Parliament were petitioned to stop enclosures, to prevent combination and forestalling. The London Common Council recommended to Parliament, "the stoppage of all distillation of corn, and the permitting the importation of all sorts of grain, duty free."¹⁶ All of these recommendations required government action, though some sorts of action were designed to free the economy from previous restraints.

Wesley incorporated many of these suggestions in a letter to several London newspapers at the end of 1772,¹⁷ which he republished in slightly expanded form as a tract early in 1773, under the title, *Thoughts on the Present Scarcity of Provisions*.¹⁸ Here Wesley abandoned dependence on private philanthropy and turned to government aid to solve the economic crisis. As he saw it, the depression would soon end if food prices were forced down. This would increase consumer purchasing power, which would in turn stimulate production and provide employment again for the starving masses. He therefore proposed a number of governmental measures to force down prices artificially. Specifically he suggested:

1. To reduce the price of wheat and barley, all distilling should be prohibited, starch should be made of rice, and the importation

of both rice and bread-corn should be encouraged. He was particularly hopeful about the possibilities of prohibition, since he estimated that "little less than half the wheat produced in the kingdom" was consumed in distilling.

2. To reduce the price of oats, the number of horses must be reduced. This could be done by, (1) levying a tax of ten pounds on every horse exported to France, and by, (2) increasing the tax on gentlemen's carriages to "five pounds yearly upon every horse."

3. A reduction of the price of beef and mutton should follow the increase in sheep and cattle breeding that ought to follow the reduction in the horse trade.

4. To reduce the price of pork and poultry, (1) big farms must be broken up, "by letting no farms of above an hundred pounds a year," since only on small farms are pigs and chickens raised, and, (2) the wasteful eating habits of the gentry, who will "boil down three dozen of neat's tongues, to make two or three quarts of soup," must be repressed, "by laws, by example, or by both."

5. The price of land could also be reduced by restraining luxury, since luxury forces up a gentleman's household expenses, and leads him to charge higher rents than he would otherwise.

6. Finally taxes should be reduced, by "discharging half the national debt," and "by abolishing all useless pensions... especially those ridiculous ones given to some hundreds of idle men, as Governors of forts and castles."

While some of these economic suggestions sound hopelessly naive, others of them show considerable insight. Few modern economists would expect a prohibition of all distilling or a tax on horses to bring a nation out of a depression. But Wesley did see that a consequence of the enclosure movement, and the ever bigger specialized farms it created, was to reduce the supplies of perishable foods like eggs. His proposal to abolish useless pensions is reminiscent of Burke's program of economical reform. Even his suggestion that the national debt be cut in half is not too far-fetched. After all, Ricardo wanted to cut the Napoleonic war debt by a capital levy, and Lord Keynes suggested the same method as a way of quickly reducing England's debt following the first World War.

Throughout these proposals, Wesley shows great faith in the government's power of taxation and control of finances. He remains, however, rather vague on precisely how he expects the government to implement these proposals. In his original letter to the London papers,

he concludes by saying, "How this can be done the wisdom of the great council of the land can best determine." By 1773, when he printed the proposal in tract form, he was evidently less sanguine about Parliamentary action, for he ends with the fear that nothing will be done until God arises to maintain his own cause.

Wesley was not quite content to leave the problem in the hand of God, however. In the middle of 1775, we find him writing letters from Ireland to two of the most powerful men in the British government, warning them of the dangers of a revolution, just as in 1640, partly because of the widespread dissemination of anti-monarchic propaganda, but also because of two economic factors: "the one that there was at the time [1640] a general decay of trade almost throughout the kingdom; the other that there was an uncommon dearness of provisions. The case is the same in both respects at this day. So that even now there are multitudes of people that, having nothing to do and nothing to eat, are ready for the first bidder; and that, without inquiring into the merits of the cause, would flock to any that would give them bread."¹⁹ Wesley appends no positive suggestions as to how to solve these problems.

The economic situation improved after 1775, without the government adopting any of the drastic measures suggested by Wesley and others, and without the government having to face the predicted revolution — internally. The government did, of course, have to face revolution in another quarter — overseas, in the American colonies. That crisis provided another environmental shock which stimulated Wesley's thought on social problems in yet another direction.

The basic issues separating the colonies from mother Britain were probably political. At least that is the way it seemed to Wesley, and so the bulk of his reaction lies outside the scope of this article. Still, the issue of "taxation without representation" raised the problem of the government's economic powers, and so Wesley's thought on this point reveals something more of his attitude toward economic problems.

Wesley conceived of the British government as a family writ large, ordained of God for the benefit of the British people. He often speaks of the king as a father to his people, and applies the analogy specifically to George III: "King George is the father of all his subjects; and not only so, but he is a good father. He shows his love to them on all occasions; and is continually doing all that is in his power to make his subjects happy."²⁰ He indignantly repudiated the idea that governmental power derived from any historic social contract or depended on continued popular consent.²¹

The powers Wesley assigns to this paternal sovereign are not extensive, however. They consist, fundamentally, of the police powers and the powers of taxation. Protection against riot was particularly necessary to the Methodists, because of the disturbances which often attended their early meetings. Wesley had early expressed the hope that the governmental authorities " 'would effectually suppress, and thoroughly discountenance, all riots and popular insurrections, which evidently strike at the foundation of all government.' " ²²

The power to tax, we have already noticed, seemed to Wesley to be a fine instrument for the relief of economic distress. Given his attitude toward the king and toward taxation, it is not surprising that he did not sympathize with the American attempt to escape taxation without representation. This becomes most clear in his *A Calm Address to our American Colonies*, a tract which abridges and summarizes Samuel Johnson's famous pamphlet, *Taxation no Tyranny*.²³ Toward the end of this pamphlet he insists that "every Sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects; that is 'grant their property, with or without consent.' Our Sovereign (Wesley's note: "That is, in connexion with the Lords and Commons") has a right to tax me, and all other Englishmen, whether we have votes for Parliament-men or no."²⁴ This, then, is the main influence on Wesley's economic thought of the controversy preceding the American Revolution: he became convinced that the essentially economic power to tax was of the essence of political sovereignty and could not be surrendered to the people.

The third source of Wesley's economic ideas was the thought of certain economists of eighteenth century England. I could find no evidence that Wesley was ever aware of the work of Adam Smith, the one among them who holds the highest reputation today. But Wesley in his omnivorous reading could not avoid the newly emerging science of political economy altogether. A pamphlet that began to turn his mind in new directions was one titled, *A short essay on the Corn Trade, and the Corn Laws: Containing a general relation of the present method of carrying on the Corn Trade, and the purport of the laws relating thereto in this Kingdom* (London, 1776), attributed to Charles Smith.²⁵

This tract contained some ideas new to Wesley. "In particular, that if corn sells for twice as much now as it did at the time of the Revolution, it is in effect no dearer than it was then, because we have now twice as much money; that if other things sell now for twice as much as they did then, corn ought to do so too; that though the price of all things increases as money increases, yet they are

really no dearer than they were before; and lastly, that to petition Parliament to alter these things, is to put them upon impossibilities, and can answer no end but that of inflaming the people against their Governors."²⁶

Here Wesley found a new explanation for the rising grain prices which had worried him so much a few years earlier. A general rise in all prices, rather than the wicked acts of individual distillers and foreclosers, was now held to be responsible for the high cost of food. And petitions to Parliament to act were shown to be useless. This argument may have shaken the faith in governmental action to relieve depression, which Wesley had evidenced so clearly in 1772 and 1773. It may have prepared his mind to pay more serious attention to the thought of one of the leading economists of his day.

That man was the Rev. Josiah Tucker, Dean of Gloucester, of whom it was rather maliciously said, "religion was his trade, and trade his religion."²⁷ Tucker had been interested in economic problems ever since first assuming his first religious duties in the booming port of Bristol. He never won an enduring fame even approaching that of Adam Smith, however, largely because his master-work, *The Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes*, one of the first fairly sophisticated systematic surveys of the entire field of economics, was never published, and circulated only among a few friends.²⁸ But Tucker's pamphlets on various economic and political issues were widely known and are frequently referred to in polemical literature of the period.²⁹

John Wesley had long known and admired Tucker. In 1739, the year following his return from America and his conversion experience, he had met Tucker.³⁰ In 1740, he had been "much comforted" by Tucker's sermon and method of administering communion, at All Saints in Bristol.³¹ At the same time, however, Wesley became involved in public dispute with Tucker. *The Principles of a Methodist*, which Wesley composed in 1742, was written in direct answer to Tucker's highly critical study, *A brief History of the Principles of Methodism*, and marks, Wesley said, "the first time I have appeared in controversy, properly so called."³² Wesley always respected Tucker, however, and said that he was a gentleman even in polemics.³³

Though he obviously could not share Tucker's opinion of Methodism, Wesley came to be influenced considerably by his ideas on social problems. During the American Revolution controversy, for example, Wesley at first adopted the Dean of Gloucester's view that the colonies should be cut loose from the British Empire.³⁴ Tucker had argued that the colonies would be forced by economic necessity

to turn to England for a market, even after independence, and that by saddling the Americans with the charges of defending themselves against the French and Indians, England would be better off in the long run. Wesley changed his view on this problem after reading Johnson's pamphlet, which was itself in part a reply to Tucker.³⁵

The most striking example of Tucker's influence on Wesley, however, is revealed in the pamphlet, *A Serious Address to the People of England, with Regard to the State of the Nation*.³⁶ In his pamphlet, Wesley quotes verbatim the better part of a tract by Tucker titled, *The State of the Nation in 1777 Compared with the State of the Nation in the famous year of Conquest and Glory, 1759*.³⁷ He begins by adopting Tucker's analytical framework:

The state of the nation has respect to nine capital articles; population, agriculture, manufactures; the land and fresh-water carriage of goods, salt-water carriage of goods; the state of our fisheries at home and abroad, the tendency of our taxes, the clear amount of revenue, and the national debt.

This analysis is not exceedingly original with Tucker. It parallels closely that of the contemporary political economist, Sir James Steuart, who divided his master-work, *Principles of Political Oeconomy*, into volumes on, (1) population and agriculture, (2) trade and industry, (3) money and coin, (4) credit and debts, (5) taxes.³⁸ But it was through Tucker that Wesley became acquainted with the desirability of analyzing economy before deciding on policy.

Wesley, in his tract, then proceeds to examine each of Tucker's nine categories. In some cases he simply quotes Tucker; in others he adds observations of his own. In every case he comes up with the conclusion that England's economy is in better condition in 1778 than it had been in 1759. This is a judgment that is hard to document, since the science of statistics had not been developed as perfectly or applied as conscientiously in the eighteenth century as it has in our day. Tucker and Wesley rely for the most part on personal observation. They find evidence for an increase in population in the number of new houses that have been built all over the country, particularly around the cities. They find evidence for an increase in fresh-water carriage of goods in the number of new canals being built. Tucker is somewhat more concrete when he comes to salt-water carriage of goods. To prove that the total English fleet is bigger than ever, he says that, although 800 English ships have been taken since the beginning of the war, 900 enemy ships have been captured, a net gain of 100 ships. Obviously Tucker and Wesley were both aware of the boom in Britain's economy that the rapidly accelerating Industrial Revolution was creating.

Of particular interest are the passages on financial policy. Tucker, to begin with, asks of the tax policy a moral question, "Do our taxes in general, especially those which took place the last year, tend to make the people diligent and frugal, or idle and extravagant?" He concludes that diligence has triumphed and points with special approval to repeal of "that very injudicious tax which in a manner prohibited the importing of butter, tallow, lard, and other articles, from Ireland." This reveals a laissez-faire tendency, though it is based on moral grounds. Certainly Tucker was never as whole-hearted a supporter of laissez-faire as Adam Smith.

A second financial matter that concerned Tucker was the national debt. He concluded that, though it had increased greatly in absolute terms, "yet, comparatively speaking, it is not so great now, as it was in 1759." In other words, national wealth had increased so substantially in the intervening eighteen years, that a debt of the same percentage of total national wealth as before was even less a burden or a danger. This argument settled Wesley's worry of 1772 about the national debt.

In copying Tucker, Wesley adopted an approach to economics that was much more analytical, much more secular, and in the long run, much more fruitful than the one he had held heretofore. He could not adopt it entirely, however. This becomes evident when we examine Wesley's postscript to the pamphlet,³⁹ in which he tries to answer two possible objections to Tucker's optimistic analysis of the English economy. These objections are, (1) bankruptcies have greatly increased, and (2) trade with the colonies in the West-Indies has decreased. The rise in bankruptcies he feels is explained by three factors: (1) the increase in trade would naturally lead to an increase in bankruptcies in absolute terms; this does not mean any comparative increase; (2) "desperate Irrational Boldness, never so common as now, which prompts such multitudes of men to enter upon Trade, with little or no Capital;" (3) the "astonishing increase of luxury among us." With this last item, Wesley reverts to a category of explanation he had used before. In explaining away the second objection, Wesley reverts back even further, suggesting a strictly religious answer. Clearly, Wesley felt, the decrease in the West-Indian trade was due to a decline in the slave trade. But in that kind of decline he delighted. "The total, final destruction of this horrid Trade, would rejoice every Lover of Mankind; Yea, tho' all our Sugar-Islands (so the inhabitants escaped) were swallowed up in the depth of the sea. Certain it is, that *England* may not only subsist, but abundantly prosper without them." How she would abundantly prosper Wesley does not

explain. Perhaps he expected God's Providence to see to it that those who abolished the moral evil of slavery were materially rewarded.

With the ending of the decade of the 1770's, Wesley's interest in economic problems seems to have declined. While he continued to exhort his followers to gain, save, and give all they could, his references to problems of political economy were rare. He did not abandon an interest in economics entirely, however. He did read and praise a book on the Hebrides, by Dr. James Anderson.⁴⁰ He particularly admired the author's condemnation of a salt duty by which "the herring-fishery there, which might be of great advantage, is so effectually destroyed that the King's revenue therefrom is annihilated; yea, that it generally, at least frequently, turns out some thousand pounds worse than nothing."⁴¹ Here again, as in the comments on the abolition of the duty on food from Ireland, Wesley shows a tendency to approve of laissez-faire policy.

In summary, then, Wesley's economic thought combined traditional Christian moralism with a rather limited awareness of the economic problems of his day and of some of the possible ways the British government could deal with them. This discovery forces, I think, a refinement of our ideas of Wesley's economic thought and consequently of his economic influence. It will not do to say that, "John Wesley did not regard it as the work of a church or a religious leader to usurp the office of radical reformer in such practical matters of social economics as land reforms, taxation, legal hours of work, rates of wages, nor did he consider that these ills would be finally remedied by intervention of government."⁴² For Wesley did worry about some of these problems and at one point recommended government intervention. It is even an exaggeration to say that, "Wesleyanism did not, of course, undertake to refute any particular form of the mercantilist economics."⁴³ Wesley did doubt the wisdom of several specific mercantilist taxes.

The ambiguity in Wesley's thought is parallel in some ways to the ambiguity in the thought of Jeremy Bentham which has confused his interpreters.⁴⁴ Just as James Mill could follow Bentham to laissez-faire, and John Stuart Mill could follow him to socialism, so the followers of Wesley have moved, in his name, in opposite directions.

In the years following Wesley's death, when the respectable people of Britain were panicked by the French Revolution, Methodist leaders insisted on the status quo, and would have nothing to do with radical democratic movements of any sort.⁴⁵ But after 1850, many Methodist leaders returned to the moral indignation at the plight of

the working class that had on occasion marked Wesley. A significant number of local preachers became prominent in organizing unions of industrial workers, miners, and agricultural laborers. The best known of the lot are probably Thomas Burt of the coal miners union, and Joseph Arch, founder of the Agricultural Labourers' Trade Union.⁴⁶

In this way, Wesley may have contributed ultimately to the rise of socialism in England. If he had returned to our world in 1932, he might well have displayed the same interest in methods of curing the misery of depression that he revealed in 1772. And certainly he would have found salutary Britain's austerity following World War II.

1. This article was originally inspired by a study written by my father, Rev. Robert Wells Kingdon, "The Development of John Wesley's Social Gospel" (Unpublished B. D. thesis, Chicago Theological Seminary, 1928). It also owes much to the encouragement of Professor J. Bartlett Brebner of Columbia University, to the library facilities of Columbia and to the Garrett Biblical Institute, and to a grant from the Teachers' Research Council of the University of Massachusetts.
2. Most important: Maldwyn Edwards, *John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century: a Study of His Social and Political Influence* (London, 1933); Kathleen Walker MacArthur, *The Economic Ethics of John Wesley* (New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago, 1936); Wellman J. Warner, *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution* (London, New York, and Toronto, 1930). Each hereafter cited by the author's last name.
3. Wesley estimates of one of his pamphlets that "within a few months, fifty, or perhaps an hundred thousand copies, in newspapers and otherwise, were dispersed throughout Great Britain and Ireland." John Wesley, *A / CALM ADDRESS / TO THE / INHABITANTS OF ENGLAND*, (London, 1777), pp. 3-4; I consulted the copy in the Indiana University Library; included in Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.* (London, 1829-1831, 3rd ed., 14 vols.), XI, 129. Hereafter cited as Wesley, *Works*. All references are to this edition. For further bibliographical information, see Rev. Richard Green, *The Works of John and Charles Wesley: a bibliography* (London, 1896), No. 316. Hereafter cited as Green, *Bibliography*.
4. Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York, 1930), trans. by Talcott Parsons, hereafter cited as Weber. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: a historical study* (London, 1936, revised edition).
5. The best modern critical edition is that of Edward H. Sugden, *Wesley's Standard Sermons* (Nashville, et al., n.d., 2 vols.). See vol. II, 309-327, for the text of this sermon; note pp. 309-311, introductory notes, for information on the frequency with which Wesley preached on this topic. Hereafter cited as Wesley, *Sermons*.
6. Warner, pp. 207-247, describes in detail these philanthropic activities, and notes that in most cases other humanitarian groups preceded the Wesleyans in developing them.
7. Wesley, *Sermons*, II, 311, introductory note.
8. T. S. Ashton, *An Economic History of England: The 18th Century* (London, 1955), pp. 22-24; 127-128. Warner, pp. 137, ff. provides an excellent analysis of the utility of the Methodist virtue of industry. I feel he overlooks some of the possibilities of the Methodist virtue of thrift.
8. MacArthur, pp. 94-95. Based on Wesley, *Sermons*.
10. Wesley, *Sermons*, II, 323.
11. Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-143, summarizes Methodism, emphasizing its emotionalism but saying practically nothing of its ethic. Elsewhere, e.g. pp. 175-176, Weber discusses Wesley's ethic and its economic implications very briefly.
12. T. S. Ashton, *The Industrial Revolution 1760-1830* (London, New York, and Toronto, 1948), p. 145.
13. Robert F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1945), 37-39. Hereafter cited as Wearmouth, *Eighteenth Century*.
14. Nehemiah Curnock, ed., *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M.* (London, 1909, Standard edition, 8 vols.), IV, 268, 27 June 1758. Hereafter cited as Wesley, *Journal*.

15. The following examples are taken from contemporary press reports cited by Wearmouth, *Eighteenth Century*, pp. 63, ff.
16. *London Evening Post*, November 19-21, 1772, quoted by Wearmouth, *Eighteenth Century*, p. 66.
17. Rev. L. Tyerman, *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.* (New York, 1872, 3 vols.), III, pp. 130-134, quotes in entirety the letter as published in *Lloyd's Evening Post*, December 21, 1772, and *Leeds Mercury*, December 29, 1772. Wearmouth, *Eighteenth Century*, p. 66, n. 2, discovered it also in the *London Chronicle*, December 17-19, 1772, but fails to note its republication in Wesley, *Works*.
18. Wesley, *Works*, XI, 53-59. This version provides the basis for the following analysis. For a convenient summary of this tract see MacArthur, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-111. She notes that these ideas are repeated, in a strikingly similar form, by William Brooke, *The True Causes of Our Present Distress for Provisions* (London: Whittingham and Symonds, 1800). See also Green, *Bibliography*, No. 286.
19. John Telford, ed., *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (London, 1931, Standard edition, 8 vols.), VI, 159, in Wesley to the Earl of Dartmouth, Secretary of State for the Colonies, 14 June 1775; cf. p. 163, Wesley to Lord North, First Lord of the Treasury, 15 June 1775, for an almost identical letter. Hereafter cited as Wesley, *Letters*.
20. John Wesley, *A Word to a Smuggler* (January 30, 1767), in *Works*, XI, 174. For further bibliographical information see Green, *Bibliography*, No. 239.
21. [John Wesley], *THOUGHTS/CONCERNING/THE ORIGIN OF POWER* (Bristol, 1772), reprinted in *Works*, XI, 46-53. I consulted the copy in the Indiana University Library. For further bibliographical information see Green, *Bibliography*, No. 280. See also Edwards, pp. 24, ff., and 70-81.
22. Wesley, *Journal*, III, 169, from a letter to an unidentified friend dated March 11, 1745. Cf. Warner, pp. 103, ff.
23. John Wesley, *A CALM/ADDRESS/TO/OUR AMERICAN/COLONIES./* (London, n.d., but 1775; *Ibid.*, . . . A NEW EDITION, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED./ . . . ; Taxation no Tyranny; /AN/ANSWER/TO THE/RESOLUTIONS AND ADDRESS/OF THE/AMERICAN CONGRESS./ (London, 1775), attributed to Samuel Johnson. I consulted the copies in the Indiana University Library. The second edition of Wesley's pamphlet is reprinted in *Works*, XI, 80-90. Only in this edition did Wesley give credit to Johnson's tract. Johnson apparently did not mind. See Edwards, p. 74. For further information, see Green, *Bibliography*, No. 305; and Tyerman, *op. cit.*, III, 185, ff. The other pamphlet is reprinted in Alexr. Chalmers, ed., *The Works of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* (Philadelphia, 1825, 6 vols.), IV, 332-362. Hereafter cited as *Works of Samuel Johnson*.
24. Wesley, *Works*, XI, 89.
25. F. M. Jackson, list of books alluded to by Wesley in his *Journal*, published in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, IV, 209. Hereafter cited as WHS.
26. Wesley, *Journal*, IV, 125-126, 2 September 1776.
27. Walter Ernest Clark, *Josiah Tucker, Economist: a study in the history of economics* (New York, 1903), p. 27, n. 3, reports that this is Tucker's version of a malicious epigram William Warburton coined about him. Clark provides the most authoritative study of Tucker.
28. Robert Livingston Schuyler, *Josiah Tucker: a selection from his economic and political writings* (New York, 1931), includes an edition of the *Elements*, pp. 51-219, and a useful introduction on Tucker.
29. E.g. Samuel Johnson in *Taxation no Tyranny* (London, 1775), refers to Tucker's arguments on the American colonial situation, on pp. 45 and 83-84; or *Works of Samuel Johnson*, IV, 347, 360. See above, note 22, for more bibliographical information.
30. Wesley, *Journal*, II, pp. 178d., 181d., 245d., April-July 1739.
31. Wesley, *Journal*, II, 341, 3 April 1740.
32. Wesley, *Works*, VIII, 359, at the beginning of edition of *The Principles of a Methodist*. See Green, *Bibliography*, No. 35, for further bibliographical information. The editor of Wesley, *Works*, errs in dating this tract in 1740. Green demonstrates this.
33. Wesley, *Letters*, III, 273, Wesley's public letter to John Bailey, Rector of Cork, 8 June 1750.
34. Wesley, *Letters*, VI, 199, Wesley to Christopher Hopper, 26 December 1775.
35. Wesley, *Works*, XI, 80, introduction to *A Calm Address to our American Colonies*. See above, note 23, for more bibliographical information.
36. John Wesley, *A SERIOUS/ADDRESS/TO/THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND,/WITH REGARD TO/THE STATE OF THE NATION./* (London, 1778). I consulted the copy in the Newberry Library, Chicago. The tract is reprinted in Wesley, *Works*, XI, 140-149, but a three-page postscript which concludes the original, is omitted. See Green, *Bibliography*, No. 327. For Wesley's explanation of why he wrote this pamphlet, see Wesley, *Journal*, VI, 180-181, 17 February 1778. He hoped to 'remove, if possible, the apprehensions which have been so diligently spread, as if it [the nation] were on the brink of ruin.'

37. I consulted the copy in the British Museum, Mss. 34414, f. 568. It is a single proof-sheet, which gives as author, Tucker's title, "the Dean of Gloucester," not his name. Wesley, *Works*, XI, 147, similarly omits the name but uses the title. The only printed mention of this pamphlet I have been able to find is in the check-list of Tucker's works compiled by Clark, p. 249, no. 42. I have found no mention of the fact that Wesley reprinted it in his tract.
38. E. A. J. Johnson, *Predecessors of Adam Smith: the growth of British economic thought* (New York, 1937), pp. 213, and ff.
39. This postscript can be found only in the original edition. The edited copy in Wesley, *Works*, XI, 140-149, omits it without any indication. See above, note 36.
40. WHS, IV, 236, Jackson's list of books Wesley alludes to in his Journal. This particular one: "Anderson, Dr. James. *An Account of the present state of the Hebrides and West Coast of Scotland, with hints for encouraging the fisheries, and promoting other improvements in those countries*. Edinburgh. 1785. Illustrated with a map."
41. Wesley, *Journal*, VII, 162, 11 May 1786.
42. Kathleen MacArthur, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35. For similar conclusions, see John Alfred Faulkner, *Wesley as Sociologist, Theologian, Churchman* (New York and Cincinnati, 1918), p. 32, "Wesley was no socialist. He had no social program, except the Pauline one of humble obedience to the powers that be."; and Maldwyn Edwards, *op. cit.*, p. 180, "Wesley would, in any case, have opposed Governmental interference, because he believed profoundly in individual effort."
43. Warner, p. 276.
44. See J. Bartlet Brebner, "Laissez Faire and State Intervention in Nineteenth-Century Britain," *The Making of English History*, ed. by Robert Livingston Schuyler and Herman Ausubel (New York, 1952), pp. 501-510, for a final debunking of the Dicey thesis that Bentham is the father of British laissez-faire. Reprinted, with minor changes by the author, from *The Journal of Economic History, Supplement*, VIII (1948), 59-73.
45. Robert F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Working-Class Movements of England, 1800-1850* (London, 1937). Cf. Elie Halévy, *England in 1815* (London, 1949), trans. by E. I. Watkin and D. A. Barker, for the classic statement of the great significance of this development in Methodism.
46. R. F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes, 1850-1900* (Leicester, 1954). Cf. the much sketchier analysis of the same material by D. D. Thompson, *John Wesley as a Social Reformer* (New York and Cincinnati, 1898).

THE SACRAMENTS IN EARLY AMERICAN METHODISM

PAUL S. SANDERS, *Amherst College*

In an essay written in 1929¹ Professor Tillich concluded that the sacraments continue to exist in modern Protestantism largely through historical impetus. The conservatism of custom and a vague awareness that their observance is somehow due to our Lord are apparently sufficient to prevent their total extinction. The last generation has of course witnessed a liturgical revival in our churches; but this new interest is by no means universal and appears on the whole to be superficial. It is less devoted to an understanding of Christian faith which might require liturgical expression than to the ornamentation of the places and procedures of worship. Its activity is rooted less in theology than in aesthetics and psychology, being perhaps more often an expression of cultural sophistication than of any serious appreciation of the sacramental quality of Christian life.

Contemporary theological reconstruction would benefit from an historical study of the place of the sacraments in the evolution of Protestantism. How, for instance, has it come about that Presbyterians so little know and appreciate the sacramental teaching of Calvin? The concern of this paper, a modest inquiry into one small part of the large question, may be posed as follows: How does it happen, considering its Wesleyan roots, that American Methodism places so little value upon the sacraments?

As thus phrased the question implies two statements which if true will simply describe matters of fact, and it seeks a connecting link between them. It implies that Wesley practiced a sacramental Christianity. It implies that contemporary American Methodism is typically non-sacramentalist, not to say anti-sacramentalist. Without seeking to establish it further, the latter point may be referred to Tillich's discussion, to my comment on the so-called liturgical revival, and to your own assessment of the temper of American Methodism. The former point will be dealt with immediately.

The remainder of the paper will suggest one area in which the causal connections are to be looked for. Our study will be limited to the period from Methodist beginnings here in 1766 to the division of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844, a date which adequately delimits the first period of internal development.

WESLEY'S SYNTHESIS OF EVANGELICALISM AND SACRAMENTALISM

However inevitable the eventual separation of Methodism from the Church of England may now appear to have been, Wesley's own estimate of the relationship is clear. The worship of Methodism, he once wrote, is deliberately defective; like the sermons at the University it presupposes as its proper context the whole complex of corporate worship which is found only in the larger Christian community.² His missionary endeavors presupposed the same matrix; as he often said, Wesley was only preaching the "plain old religion of the Church" which people insisted on calling by the "new name of Methodism."³ His lifelong attachment to the English Church was no mere sentiment, but derived from his profoundly soteriological evaluation of the Christian community.⁴

Wesley's conversion at Aldersgate in May 1738 did not, as is frequently claimed, result in an evangelicalism which depreciated the Christian tradition as the objective bearer of redemptive Love. His earliest biographers were content to describe what on occasion seemed to them contrary emphases in Wesley's thought and practice.⁵ The issue was first seriously confused in the later nineteenth century when certain Anglo-Catholics, stressing his sacramentalism apart from his evangelicalism, tried to claim Wesley as their own.⁶ The Methodists replied by perpetrating the same error in reverse: they accented his evangelicalism apart from his sacramentalism.⁷ Most importantly, that aspect of Wesley which was emphasized was reinterpreted in terms dictated by the respective concerns of each of the warring factions.

Wesley was never a high churchman in the Tractarian sense; yet so obvious a fact has seldom been rightly considered. Nor was he one of those "high and dry" eighteenth century churchmen recently described by George Every.⁸ That he may have been to a degree before Aldersgate; but he could slough off the several characteristics of ritualism, asceticism and legalism without its affecting his fundamental stance. He was, most characteristically, a holdover (as Abbey and Overton have said) of a type of churchman standing in lineal descent from Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, George Herbert and Jeremy Taylor.⁹ And this he was before and after his conversion.

Wesley did not become a revivalist as the nineteenth century would later use that term. Those who have glorified the importance of Wesley's conversion and those who have disparaged it are equally wrong; in George Croft Cell's graphic phrase, "tarred with the same fallacious pitch."¹⁰ The error lies in their all having interpreted the conversion in subjectivistic terms.

Aldersgate gave to Wesley a sense of acceptance before God

through no merit of his own but through Christ's atoning blood. What God had done for him he felt constrained to tell all men that God wanted to do for them also. It was not in his own experience but in the Love of God which effectuated that experience that the origin and power of the Revival lay. Wesley's stress on the initiative of divine grace led him to declare that "the true Gospel touches the very edge of Calvinism."¹¹ The means of congress between God and man were seen as divinely appointed: the Word and sacraments, mediated through the historic church, instruments for the use of the Holy Spirit. Certainly he was accustomed to describe vital religion as "experimental"; but, as Sydney Dimond has said, "Assurance . . . was saved from subjectivism by a larger conception of the grace whereby we are saved."¹² Those interpreters are surely wrong who see in Wesley a proto-Schleiermacher.

Wesley's mature theology—though he may not have used either term—was both Catholic and Evangelical, a synthesis holding together in uneasy but fruitful tension polarities which cannot be pulled together neatly, yet each of which is necessary to its opposite number, as both are to the whole.¹³

In his realization that man of himself can do nothing to save himself, his belief in God's universal love and prevenient grace, and his stress on the necessity of personal acceptance of God's offer of salvation, Wesley was deeply evangelical. In his insistence that genuine religion is social, his demand for "fruits of righteousness," his careful system of nurture, his stress upon corporate worship, his delight in the communion of saints, and his appeal to reason and Christian history, he was genuinely Catholic.

The role of his conversion—which was of course profoundly important—must be carefully assessed. What it did, precisely, was to put God at the center of his life rather than himself. It is exactly this which precludes his being read in terms of nineteenth century revivalism (or twentieth century liberalism) fully as much as it precludes his being read in terms of ecclesiasticism of whatever sort. Wesley preached no new Gospel but rather the Reformed Catholicism of classical Anglicanism. If it seemed new it was only because personal conviction and the needs of the times had given it a new urgency.

In the light of such an interpretation of Wesley's theological orientation his specific teachings on the sacraments must be studied. A careful survey of the sources for ascertaining his baptismal theology leaves one not altogether sure of his meaning. Since, in any event, Baptism quite naturally played no role in the progress of English

Methodism in his lifetime, what can be said may be deferred to the study of American Methodism.

With the Lord's Supper the case is entirely different. Allowing for Miss Underhill's Anglo-Catholic bias one may yet agree that the Wesleyan Revival was as much a sacramental as an evangelical revival;¹⁴ to the dry religiosity of the eighteenth century the one was as much a stranger as the other. Wesley's understanding of the Lord's Supper is chiefly expressed in the 166 Eucharistic hymns based upon Dean Brevint's treatise *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*.¹⁵ Issued over the names of both brothers, the hymns went through nine editions in Wesley's lifetime and the abridged tract was issued besides in separate editions. The doctrine set forth there is consistent and clear, and is reinforced by many other references adduced from Wesley's works.¹⁶

As a memorial of the death of Christ the sacrament is no mere reminder of that event, but a true *anamnesis*; the eternal meaning of the event is made here and now operative for faith.¹⁷ As symbols the bread and wine re-present the body and blood of Christ as spiritual nourishment with which the Living Christ feeds His people now. The elements are signs; not bare signs, but efficacious signs of the grace they signify. The Eucharist does not itself confer grace, but the Holy Spirit through the sacrament does confer grace; a Christian will not despise the means. Through expectant use of the means ordained by our Lord, faithful communicants are vouchsafed His Real Presence. That Christ is really present as both Host and Food Wesley had no doubt. It would be gratuitous to add that by this Wesley meant no form of *impanation*. His doctrine is most clearly related to that of Calvin mediated through the seventeenth century divines.

The Holy Supper is a communion feast in which Christians share in Christ and in each other, not only those present but the whole community of saints, in heaven as on earth. It is both anticipation and pledge of the Messianic Banquet when Christ shall have secured His Kingdom. The Wesleyan Eucharistic hymns supplementing the Anglican liturgy revived the eschatological note that had been missing in Western liturgies from earliest centuries.

The Eucharist, moreover, is a sacrifice. Each celebration represents the "one oblation, once offered," as also Christ's eternal Sacrifice in heaven. Nowhere is the synthetic character of Wesley's theology more clear than here. In the Eucharist man cannot offer Christ again, nor at all; least of all, instead of himself. Christ eternally offers Himself. Through faith man may claim Christ's self-oblation re-presented in the sacrament. In receiving man offers himself in the sacra-

ment to God. To be able to claim Christ's sacrifice he must give himself; to be able to give himself he must claim Christ's sacrifice. The Eucharist is at once a call to utter consecration and a means of following the call to the utmost.

Actual reception of the Living Christ depends on faith, in the sense that an unbeliever does not receive Him, but not in the sense that it is the faith of the communicant which effects Christ's Presence. He is present by the Word and Holy Spirit; He is appropriated by faith. The Eucharist bestows grace not only on the justified but on earnest seekers as well. No preparation is required other than a willingness to receive what God offers and to do what God requires to be done. The promises of God are to all; the sacrament is both a converting and sustaining ordinance, symbolizing, witnessing to, and effectuating all that is in the Gospel promised to him who accepts. And since so great benefits flow from the faithful use of the sacrament, it should be received—in Wesley's word—constantly, as often as possible. To do so shows a spirit receptive to the promise of grace and thankful for grace bestowed.

If it is true that Christian faith is defined by action as well as words, then Wesley's own constant reception of the Holy Supper, his frequent admonition to his people to communicate, his evident joy in the large numbers who flocked to celebrations, his instruction to hesitating Methodists that the character of an unworthy celebrant in no way vitiates the efficacy of the sacrament, his observance of great festivals with a daily celebration throughout the octave, his explicit instruction to the Americans that the Eucharist be celebrated every Sunday, and finally, that most bitterly debated of his actions, the irregular ordinations to provide a sacramental ministry for America—all these witness to an understanding of the Gospel in which sacramentalism is so intimately related to evangelicalism as to be put asunder only at the peril of the wholeness of the faith.

THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN METHODISM

Arising through the efforts of private members and occasional lay preachers who had come to America for reasons of their own, Methodism from its beginnings here was nearly autonomous. Wesley sent over only eight official missionaries. Francis Asbury, the only one who stayed to make a lasting impression, was only 27 years old when he arrived, had had little experience, and was no thoroughgoing Anglican—hardly a man to have been able to interpret the mind of Wesley to the Societies on this side. Yet it was Asbury who must be accounted the founder of American Methodism, even when one allows for his sincere efforts to keep the Americans under Wesley's control.

In any case the remove to America must have exerted influences further tending to remold Methodism, for it could not but be touched by the cultural spirit. Individualism and voluntarism were fundamental values, in religion as in politics and in society at large. Nourished in a society largely unchurched, most active in colonies where Anglicanism represented social, political and cultural values not shared by the dissenting churches around them, the American Methodists were from the beginning not only autonomous but indigenous.

The early center of the movement was in Virginia, where its beginnings had coincided with the Southern phase of the Great Awakening. Aside from Asbury and Shadford, the most successful preachers were ones such as Strawbridge and Williams, suspect to Wesley because of their attitude toward the Church. Native preachers recruited from the ranks of the newly converted came to share the leadership. Lacking familiarity with the mind of Wesley, as indeed with any larger frame of reference in which to interpret their own conversion or that of any one else, they pursued their preaching not as an adjunct of the English Church but as an isolated revivalistic movement. To equate their position with even the evangelical side of Wesley's synthesis is unwarrantable.

While in 1776 some Virginia Methodists refused to join with Baptists and Presbyterians in the fight for religious liberty, averring that they wished to be considered Anglicans, not dissenters,¹⁸ yet the opposite is more nearly the case. Actual contact between Anglicans and Methodists was slight, even in Virginia. The Methodist people by no means all considered themselves Anglicans. Some belonged to other churches; perhaps most had no church affiliation at all, finding in the Societies whatever spiritual nourishment they had. Some of the preachers were friendly toward the Church, some hostile; most were indifferent. The Anglican parsons who interested themselves in Methodism were few enough to be counted on one hand. Since the origin of their sympathies lay precisely in a feeling that Anglicanism as practiced here was lacking in evangelical fervor, they would not have been effective in acquainting the preachers with the Church's finest claims.

The Sacramental Controversy which racked the movement from 1772 through 1781 revealed the lack of any effective relationship between Methodism and its putative parent together with a growing sectarian spirit among the Methodists. A number of preachers and members had insisted on having the sacraments in their Societies; some of the preachers, having engaged in mutual ordination, began to baptize and celebrate the Lord's Supper. The controversy was finally halted by a tentative decision to stay by the Church until more direct ad-

vice might be had from Wesley. Meanwhile the Revolution came to an end and the Anglican establishment was ended. Wesley was but putting the best face on the situation when in September 1784 he wrote: "They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free."¹⁹

Organized during Christmastide, 1784, the Methodist Episcopal Church was now clearly intended to be a *church*, no longer a preaching mission ambiguously related to Anglicanism. It was furnished an ecclesiastical order: general superintendents, elders and deacons, together with lay preachers and private members, under a centralized system of discipline. It was furnished a standard of doctrine: the Thirty-Nine Articles revised to accord more nearly with the doctrinal needs of the situation and express more clearly an Arminianism already found in them by Anglican theologians. It was furnished forms of worship, together with an Ordinal, in a slightly revised and abridged Prayer Book called *The Sunday Service*; as also a hymn book, significantly a collection of Psalm paraphrases such as were commonly sung in the English Church. Wesley's recommendations had furnished the basis of organization; but Asbury had refused to comply with Wesley's directive that he serve as joint superintendent with Coke, until they should have been elected by the American preachers. These two facts may serve to illustrate the tension between the native bent of American Methodism and the Anglican cast of its Wesleyan legacy, a tension which would run as a *leit-motiv* through its subsequent history.

THE SACRAMENTS IN EARLY AMERICAN METHODISM

The sixty years from 1784 to 1844 include the Second Awakenings, the Finney era, and the period of most rapid and extensive westward movement. Antedating the rise of any native Methodist theologian, they constitute the new church's first period of internal development and external adjustment. The first decade suffices to show what would prove the main trend.

The Psalm paraphrases were simply ignored. There came into general use a collection of evangelistic hymns, first issued in England in a pirated edition by a preacher Robert Spence, who had been roundly belabored by Wesley for his pains. This was published in Philadelphia in 1790 over the names of Coke and Asbury.²⁰ Containing many Wesleyan hymns, and covering nearly every aspect of "heart religion," it was admirably suited to its original intended purpose. But it was not adequate, nor had it been intended, to cover all the occasions of faith, life and worship about which a *church* needs to sing. Augmented from time to time, it remained until 1836 the recommended hymnal. Not

until 1849 was a hymnal published which presented in comprehensive fashion hymns on the whole round of Christian life.

The *Sunday Service*, as Jesse Lee wrote with scarcely concealed satisfaction, was soon laid aside.²¹ In 1792 the forms for administering the sacraments, the Ordinal, and the occasional services were revised and taken over into the Discipline; the rest disappeared. It had been the prayer book which marked out the form of the new church at its organization in 1784. The next year when the first Discipline was printed it was appended to the Prayer Book. In 1786 a new edition of both was issued under one cover. Six years later only the Discipline was printed, with one section including all that was left of the prayer book.

It is clear what was happening. Wesley had tried to produce a church by decree; he had succeeded in surrounding a preaching movement with the appurtenances of a church. And the new church went on behaving much as it had behaved as a missionary campaign. Under other circumstances Methodism might have been comprehended as a preaching order within Anglicanism. It was in fact erected in America into an independent ecclesiastical body, having the form of a church but not the self-awareness thereof. Unselfconsciously it identified the *ecclesia* with itself and proceeded to evaluate doctrine, worship and discipline in terms derived from its own parochial understanding of Christian experience. American Methodism showed itself more and more a sect. What was the place of the sacraments in this evolution?

BAPTISM

Wesley's revision of the Article on Baptism, adopted in 1784 and never changed, read as follows:²²

Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration or the new birth. The baptism of young children is to be retained in the church.

The crucial phrase would seem to be "a sign of regeneration or the new birth." Evidence in the sermons and the *Treatise on Baptism*²³ indicates that Wesley held to the Anglican view that infants are in Baptism cleansed from the guilt of original sin; Wesley's Arminianism was not the latitudinarian sort which refused to take original sin seriously. Yet his Arminianism insisted upon a universal objective atonement wrought in the death of Christ; and this Wesley seems never to have related to the teaching of baptismal regeneration.

It is plain, in any case, that whatever regeneration is wrought in Baptism he did not take to be moral regeneration.²⁴ Man grows up inevitably to sin; to be saved he must be brought to a conviction of sinfulness and an acceptance of pardoning grace. Forensic justification

may have taken place in principle in the death of Christ, or mediately in infant baptism; but moral regeneration takes place only in a conscious experience of justification continued in a conscious pursuit of holiness.

As the English Church did, so Wesley distinguished between a sign and the thing signified. Baptism did not confer grace *ex opere operato*. Was it then simply a "badge of profession"? But something must have been meant separable from a profession of faith; for Wesley directed the Americans to retain infant baptism, omitted any reference to sponsors who might be thought to make such an affirmation on the child's part, and omitted the rite of confirmation through which the baptizand might later make the affirmation his own. His meaning is to be sought in a view which preserves the objectivity of grace without compromising the responsibility of free response.

Such a view may be found in Wesley. Indeed, his strongest arguments concern Baptism as a means of incorporation within the covenant community, and the least ambiguous teaching of the revised offices is the same.²⁵ Yet Wesley omitted from the Article that portion which had described the sacrament as an instrument whereby

they that receive [it] rightly are grafted into the church; the promises of forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

Part of American Methodism's confusion regarding Baptism must be laid to Wesley.

The Article on Baptism must be interpreted in the light of that on sacraments generally. Wesley's revision reads thus:

Sacraments ordained of Christ are not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather they are certain signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

Framed originally to establish against Roman Catholics on the one hand and radical Protestants on the other the view that sacraments are sacred actions in which God and man play mutually interrelated roles, such that, as the Methodist expositor Wheeler says, in them "God embraces us and offers himself to be embraced by us,"²⁶ this Article had been changed slightly. Where the second clause had read, "but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace," Wesley's revision read, "but rather they are certain signs of grace." The Article still insists that sacraments are "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession"; by his omission Wesley may have thought to lessen the danger of an *ex opere operato* interpretation, but he retained the phrase "by which he doth work invisibly in us." It is unlikely that he

meant sacraments to be reduced to the barrenness suggested by the modern connotation of the word "sign."

The baptismal offices as revised by Wesley were free of the more obvious expressions of baptismal regeneration. Yet the rites were still capable of teaching it, as is shown by the fact that subsequent revisions were chiefly concerned to whittle away one or another instance of such language. They had been framed to express that doctrine, and short of completely overhauling them—which would be done in the twentieth century—it was impossible to express through them a view altogether devoid of the teaching that Baptism is an effectual instrument of grace.

The American revision of the offices in 1792 further omitted the several elements which most clearly defined Baptism as adoption, possibly influenced by what appeared to be the intent of the Article as revised by Wesley. It is impossible to say on the basis of the offices as they existed after that what Methodism intended by Baptism.

Changes in 1792 in the office for adult baptism opened the way for viewing that rite as believer's baptism. In a largely unchurched society and in a church whose primary aim was the conversion of adults, increased attention to adult baptism and a consequent deflection toward the Anabaptist position would not be unexpected. Indeed, for a two year period it was allowed that one baptized in infancy might be baptized again upon conversion.²⁷ But a disciplinary provision continued unchanged through the entire period under survey specifically enjoined infant baptism; memoirs of preachers are full of passages noting their defense of the practice. Moreover, a treatise on Baptism appearing as an appendix to the same 1792 Discipline, after fourteen pages defending "sprinkling" against "dipping," spent its remaining fifty-four pages defending infant baptism; of the strictly theological meaning of the sacrament there was however no indication.

The average Methodist, member or preacher, would not have derived his understanding of the sacrament from the Articles or offices alone, or even primarily. From what, then? The first American edition of Wesley appeared in 1826, though surely he had been read in English editions earlier. Watson's *Institutes* was published in New York in 1825, Adam Clarke's *Christian Theology* in 1840. The hymnal meanwhile had been augmented with baptismal hymns by Charles Wesley, Doddridge and Watts. From all these sources a meaningful doctrine could have been derived. Baptism stands witness to the grace of God seeking the salvation of every man. It furnishes the means of incorporation into the covenant fellowship where redemption through grace is normally expected to be found. It binds those baptized to trust in Christ alone for salvation and seals the promises of God that such

trust is all that is required. In Baptism there is a spiritual transaction whereby a person's status vis-a-vis the realm of redemption is changed; to view this mechanically was termed "excess," but to depreciate its reality was no less vigorously termed "defect."

But Wesley, Watson and Clarke were not the most powerful influences upon the preachers. It was not until 1828 that any standard course of reading was prescribed for the preachers; theological education was wholly lacking. There was no parochial system of pastoral care. Baptisms would have been performed sporadically whenever one of the elders or rather larger number of deacons happened on the scene. That large percentage of the preachers who were ordained were debarred from administering Baptism. How significant can the sacrament have been in the absence of any developed sense of the church?

So we have been led finally to that context in which its explication is most significant: the relation of Baptism to church membership. The usual view of the church among revivalistic Protestants in the period under consideration was in terms of voluntary association of like-minded believers. Baptists were consistently sectarian. The Halfway Covenant had of course mitigated the stringency of voluntarism among Congregationalists; the Presbyterians had generally managed to keep their covenant theology relatively intact. The Methodists were in a particular case. On the one hand sectarian patterns abounded. Despite Wesley's dictum that the only requirement for being a Methodist was a desire to be saved, the Americans tended more and more to make conversion a pre-requisite. To become a member one must go through a period of probation; he might be admitted or not, and if admitted might later be suspended. Admission and suspension and readmittance depended on meeting certain demands centering in a specific sort of experience and consequent conformity to specific moralistic criteria.

Yet there were always elements working against complete sectarianization. The centralized episcopacy and the itinerancy both provided for Methodists a sense of being an inclusive whole. Hardly less important than conversion was the nurture provided in the bands and classes; derived probably from Wesley's knowledge of the catechumenate in the primitive church, they represented that element of instruction and discipline which has been a constant element in the definition of the Christian *ecclesia*.

Nonetheless, through most of this period Methodism showed remarkably little church consciousness. The early Disciplines often have the word "society" where one expects the word "church." Communicant members of other churches were explicitly allowed to be Methodists, remaining at the same time Presbyterians or whatever. Though both instances are traceable to the peculiar origins of Methodism, they

comport strangely with the self-awareness of an autonomous church.

It was not until 1836 that any recognizable concept of church membership was put into the Discipline, not until 1856 that the relation of baptized children to the church was spelled out in the Discipline, and not until 1864 that a form for receiving members into the church was inserted into the Ritual.²⁸ By then Wesley's Arminianism was being replaced by Daniel Whedon's "Freedomism;" what in Wesley had been "gracious ability" became simply "ability."²⁹ This example of the way in which American Methodism misconstrued Wesley by dissolving his synthesis indicates also the direction in which it would finally move to delineate the meaning of Baptism; but that would not be until later in the century.

For the early period it may be concluded that Baptism must have meant less than official definitions and systematic treatises suggest. The most noticeable aspect of the question is its ambiguity. Through lack of interest, lack of theological ability, and preoccupation with what no doubt seemed a more pressing task, the church failed to arrive at any view of Baptism clear and profound enough to withstand the corrosive effect of that emasculation of evangelicalism which would be the end product of a hundred years of revivalism.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

Of the several Articles of Religion concerning the Eucharist the crucial one is No. XVIII, of which the most pertinent section reads as follows:

The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch, that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

Originally framed to refute both the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and left-wing Protestant teaching which a later Methodist described as "but a partial and inadequate statement of the nature and purpose of the Eucharist,"³⁰ the Article was adopted by the Americans unchanged.

The changes Wesley had made in the liturgy served either to make the office a more explicit expression of evangelical doctrine, as he understood it, or to adapt it to the needs of the American situation, as he understood that. In the former category are only two changes of consequence: the absolution became a prayer for pardon, the word "priest" became "elder." Changes in the latter category were more numerous: the *Sanctus* and *Gloria in excelsis* were to be said, not chant-

ed; the service was shortened by the omission of the long exhortations—which were needless, since the class meetings were a more stringent means of discipline; and rubrics pertinent only to the Anglican situation were excised. No change (save for the omission of one redundant word) was made in the Prayer of Consecration. The effort sometimes made to characterize Wesley's revision as Puritan surely breaks down here; if it had been so, he would have substituted for the Consecration a prayer of thanksgiving and the Words of Institution.

In 1792 the Americans deleted the entire Ante-Communion—all the service preceding the Offertory—and with it the concept of the Christian Year. Other changes were required by the assumption that now the Eucharist would follow a usual preaching service: e.g. the Intercessions were omitted, doubtless because they would have been included in the long extemporaneous prayer earlier. Still others were reflective of the more informal worship prevalent here: the *Sursum Corda* was omitted, along with the Proper Prefaces, and extemporaneous prayer was allowed in the liturgy itself. A rubric at the end authorized the omission of any or all of the ritual *except the Consecration*. The exact form of Eucharistic observance was evidently thought to be a matter of indifference; but a prayer expressive of an undefined but real relationship between the material elements and their spiritual use was retained as the indispensable minimum.

Drastic as the 1792 revision of Wesley's prayer book was, the forms which were preserved were not touched for another sixty years; and these the years during which the influence of revivalism and the frontier should have been most insistent. At the expense of completeness the core of the liturgy was transferred to the Discipline, the one book sure to be available. The requirement that the forms be used was doubtless not heeded literally; in 1824 the Discipline contained a special admonition on their faithful use, doubtless a reflection of a freedom approaching license. Yet the fact that they were retained and used at all indicates some attitude of conservatism toward the Wesleyan heritage.

There is no evidence of an American edition of the Eucharistic hymns, though a few were included in the *Pocket Hymn Book* and a few others added as that collection gradually evolved into a church hymnal. The one best source of Wesley's Eucharistic doctrine was therefore largely lacking.

There was no hymn on the eschatological aspect of the sacrament. It is certain these Methodists were interested in "last things." One recalls further that the great camp meetings began as Eucharistic celebrations, and this remained a normal part of most Methodist meetings. Whether any conscious relation between communion and eschatology was made, there is no evidence.

There was only one hymn on the sacrament as sacrifice. Again, it is certain these Methodists talked and sang about the sacrifice of Christ. The greater number of hymns on the Lord's Supper, whether by Wesley or others, dealt with it as a memorial of the death. But that was the least profound meaning of Wesley's teaching; rather it was the pleading of the eternal sacrifice joined with the Real Presence of the Risen Christ which made Wesley's doctrine potent. Of that particular understanding of the matter among the Americans there is no evidence at all.

Clarke's *Discourse on the Nature and Design of the Eucharist* was published in New York in 1842, having been first published in London in 1812. The teaching of such a work, taken together with that of Wesley and Watson, the Articles of Religion, the liturgy, and such Eucharistic hymns as were available, presented (even more so than in the case of Baptism) a consistent and meaningful doctrine. All alike held the Supper to be both genuine sign and seal of the mercies of God revealed in the death of Christ, as it is also both sign and seal of man's answering self-oblation. Christ is present in His Supper to be received in faith. Like Baptism the Eucharist was seen as a federal rite; participating in it through faith was believed in very fact to assure one's continuance within the covenant of grace. In the sacrament questing grace calls forth answering faith and questing faith meets answering grace.

But how widely are we to suppose that this teaching was known and understood? How often was it expounded? How frequently was the Eucharist celebrated? It remained the rule that only elders could administer the Lord's Supper. It would have been expedient to allow at least every preacher in charge of a circuit to do so; it may be argued that the failure to do this shows that Methodism was not seriously concerned to maintain a regular program of Eucharistic celebration. It could just as well be argued that the refusal to allow lay preachers, even though in charge of circuits, to celebrate constitutes another of those examples of conservatism we have encountered. In any event, communions must have been infrequent, since deacons and unordained preachers constituted the larger number of all the itinerants.

Moreover, there was a growing tendency to "fence the Table." In Notes appended to the Discipline of 1796 the two bishops had admonished the elders to be "very cautious how they admit . . . persons who are not in our society."⁸¹ Although non-members might be admitted after examination, in their case as in that of members the right to communicate appears to have rested upon being adjudged worthy. Nothing was said any more of Wesley's insistence that "honest seekers" be admitted, nor of the converting power of the Eucharist.

Certainly the Lord's Supper was not central to Methodist worship. The Love Feast may at first have been as important; it was more frequently held, and in a revivalistic atmosphere the fervent testimonies of awakened believers may have caused it to seem more vital. Still, the Eucharist would have been celebrated at every quarterly visitation by the presiding elder riding his rounds; the people may have exerted more effort to be present at those quarterly meetings than it would occur to modern Methodists to suspect.

In 1812 a curious move was taken which has ever since further complicated the effort to understand the meaning of Methodist orders: it was allowed that local preachers might be ordained. Local preachers were men in secular occupations licensed to preach and perform some functions of pastoral oversight. In the absence of a parochial system their contribution was immense; but they were (and still are) strictly differentiated from "travelling preachers"—i.e., what we should call the professional ministry. The anomalous situation was created in which a "lay" preacher might be ordained elder and yet be a member of a charge committed to an itinerant who was only a deacon or not ordained at all. The church's answer to infrequent Communion was not to allow unordained men to celebrate but to extend ordination to men who were not itinerants. But it may be supposed that after this the societies had the Communion more often.

As evangelical doctrine became stereotyped within the narrow confines of a particular anthropology and soteriology, so the Eucharist would appear to have lost its fullness of meaning. If the whole significance of justification could be thought to be satisfactorily expressed in the phrase "saved by the blood"; if the whole meaning of sanctification could be thought to be summed up in a moralistic legalism; if the richly varied theology of Wesley could be acceptably reduced to the one word "Aldersgate"; then the Eucharist could presumably be satisfactorily characterized as a memorial rite. It was not sacramentalism alone which suffered. By the end of our period Protestant theology in America, where it had come under sustained revivalistic influence, had become curiously truncated, resulting in a vast oversimplification of the problems of Christian faith and life.³²

It may be concluded that the Eucharist doubtless meant less than official definitions and systematic treatises suggest; but perhaps more than any overt evidence adduced here shows. The tenacity with which the Methodists clung to infant baptism, apparently finding in it a grace which their logic was never rightly able to assess, is indicative of their attitude. Without being articulate about it, they may have found in the Supper a means through which their gracious Lord designed to feed their hungry souls.

Early Methodism in America was insufficiently acquainted with the mind of Wesley to have been able to sympathize with his insistence that Methodism was understandable only within an Anglican structure, or to appreciate his high regard for the corporate Christian body, or to penetrate his carefully instructed theological synthesis of sacramentalism and evangelicalism. Unprepared to take its place as a church, the movement was suddenly thrust into autonomy; through sixty years, unused to its churchly institutions, untutored in classical Christian doctrine, fumblingly learning what it meant to be a church, at one turn and another it revealed through its actions the effects of its initial orphanage. Further deflected from a full-orbed Christianity by pressures from the American scene, both secular and religious, Methodism most readily aligned itself with pietistic sectarianism and thus reinforced that strain of its constitution which leaned toward moralistic and emotionalistic individualism. Constantly pursuing its missionary labors and but little given to attempts at self-definition, it came all but unconsciously to define itself—and thus to redefine its institutions—in terms of its own narrow understanding of that one primary concern.

Early Methodism in America had failed to achieve sufficient coherence to enable it to preserve the marrow of its legacy while at the same time adapting it to the demands of a new time and a new land. Although maintaining a halting loyalty to its Wesleyan heritage, the church was clearly more concerned with evangelism than with sacramentalism. Wesley's synthesis was dissolved. As revivalism was not the same as Wesley's evangelical ministry, so the confused sacramental teaching and erratic sacramental practice of the Americans was not the same as Wesley's own. The loss of the fertilizing vitality which results from keeping each close to the other was serious enough; but the loss was finally more serious. The church had been rendered peculiarly vulnerable to the infiltration of alien ideologies, and would find itself unable to maintain either evangelicalism or sacramentalism under the impact of the rise of rational idealism.

1. P. Tillich, "Nature and Sacrament," in *The Protestant Era* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 94-112.

2. J. Wesley, Minutes of the Conference; quoted in L. Tyerman, *The Life and Times of John Wesley* (6th edition, 3 vols.; London 1890), II, 576.

3. J. Wesley, *Journal* (Standard Edition, ed. N. Curnock, 8 vols.; London 1909-1916), II, 293.

4. Cf. G. C. Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York, 1935), p. 145. "Wesley's life-long resistance to the separation of his societies from the Anglican Church was therefore dictated by something far more significant than a blindly tenacious conservatism. It was dictated by an intelligent re-

ligious appreciation of the Christian Church as the means of grace. It was rooted and grounded in a profoundly soteriological evaluation of the Church" (italics Cell's).

5. J. Whitehead's *Life of the Rev. John Wesley* (London, 1793) was the first official biography. See also T. Coke and H. Moore, *Life of the Rev. Mr. Wesley* (American edition; Philadelphia, 1793); R. Watson, *Life of Rev. John Wesley* (First American edition; New York, 1853). Even Tyerman concludes that if Wesley appears inconsistent, "we must take [him] as we find him" (*op. cit.*, I, 496).

6. E.g., W. H. Holden, *John Wesley in Company with High Churchmen* (Lon-

- don, 1870); F. Hoekin, *John Wesley and Modern Methodism* (4th edition; London, 1887); R. D. Urlin, *John Wesley's Place in Church History* (London, 1870); A. S. Little, *The Times and Teaching of John Wesley* (Milwaukee, 1905).
7. E.g., J. H. Rigg, *The Churchmanship of John Wesley* (revised edition; London, 1886); *The Living Wesley* (2nd edition; London, 1891); G. J. Stevenson, *Memorials of the Wesley Family* (London, 1872).
 8. G. Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London, 1956).
 9. C. J. Abbey and J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols.; London, 1878), I, 135f.; II, 67-72. See also G. W. O. Addleshaw, *The High Church Tradition* (London, 1941); P. E. More and F. L. Cross, *Anglicanism* (Milwaukee, 1935), especially P. E. More, "The Spirit of Anglicanism" and F. R. Arnott, "Anglicanism in the Seventeenth Century."
 10. Cell, *op. cit.*, p. 185.
 11. J. Wesley, Minutes of the 1745 Conference; quoted in Cell, *op. cit.*, p. 243.
 12. S. Dimond, *The Psychology of the Methodist Revival* (London, 1926), p. 235.
 13. Cf. Cell's comment, "The Wesleyan reconstruction of the Christian ethic of life is an original and unique synthesis of the Protestant ethic of grace with the Catholic ethic of holiness" (*op. cit.*, p. 347).
 14. E. Underhill, *Worship* (New York, 1937), pp. 303-307.
 15. See J. E. Rattenbury, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley* (London, 1948) for discussion and for a reprint of the hymns and the "extract" of Brevint's tract.
 16. The chief sources for ascertaining Wesley's Eucharistic doctrine are, besides the hymns, the following: "The Duty of Constant Communion" (*Sermons on Several Occasions*, ed. by T. Jackson, 2 vols.; New York, 1831, Sermon No. CVI, written 1732, revised 1788); "The Means of Grace" (Standard Edition of the *Standard Sermons*, ed. by E. H. Sugden, 2 vols.; London, 1921, sermon XII); "Upon our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Discourse VI" (*ibid.*, sermon XXI); *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament* (London, 1755; based on Bengel's *Gnomon*, and constituting with the Standard Sermons the doctrinal standard of British Methodism); *A Roman Catholicism, with a Reply Thereto* (*Works*, 3rd American edition, ed. by J. Emory; 7 vols.; New York, 1831, Vol. V); *Papery Calmly Considered* (*ibid.*); besides hundreds of occasional and incidental references in the *Journal* and the *Letters* (Standard Edition, ed. J. Telford, 8 vols.; London, 1931), together with his revision of the Prayer Book offices and the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion for the Americans in 1784. See also J. C. Bowmer, *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism* (Westminster, 1951).
 17. Cf. G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster, 1945), p. 161.
 18. Petition presented to the Virginia Assembly; quoted in C. F. James, *Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia* (Lynchburg, 1900), p. 75.
 19. *Letters*, VII, 237ff.
 20. *A Pocket Hymn-Book, designed as a Constant Companion for the Pious* (10th edition; Philadelphia, 1790).
 21. J. Lee, *Short History of the Methodists in the United States of America 1766-1809* (Baltimore, 1810) p. 107.
 22. A comparison of the text of Wesley's revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles with the original may be found in R. Emory, *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York, 1844), pp. 95-109.
 23. The sources for Wesley's teaching on Baptism are chiefly the following: *A Treatise on Baptism* (*Works*, Vol. VI); *Notes upon the New Testament*; the following Standard Sermons: XII, "The Means of Grace;" XIV, "The Marks of the New Birth;" XV, "The Great Privilege of Those That Are Born of God;" XXXVIII, "Original Sin," and XXXIX, "New Birth;" together with Wesley's revision of the Articles of Religion and the offices of the Book of Common Prayer.
 24. See especially Standard Sermons XIV, XV, and XXXIX. Wesley very nearly overstated his case in the sermon on Original Sin (XXXVIII), so anxious was he to confute the Socinian views of Dr. John Taylor. Proper emphasis must be allowed his insistent stress on prevenient grace.
 25. See N. B. Harmon, *The Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism* (Nashville, 1926) for a detailed study of changes in the offices.
 26. H. Wheeler, *History and Exposition of the Twenty-five Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York, 1908), p. 281.
 27. Emory, *op. cit.* p. 45. This was in 1784; the action was rescinded in 1786. All subsequent references to Disciplinary provisions are taken from Emory.
 28. Cf. F. G. Hibbard, *Christian Baptism* (New York, 1842); *The Religion of Childhood* (Cincinnati, 1864).
 29. Cf. L. H. Scott, "Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century," *Religion in Life*, XXV, 1 (Winter, 1955-56), 87-98.
 30. Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p. 314.
 31. Emory, *op. cit.*, p. 323.
 32. Cf. S. E. Mead, "American Protestantism During the Revolutionary Epoch," *Church History*, XXII, 4 (December 1953), 279-297.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY: A PROGRESS REPORT ON RESEARCH AND STUDY*

HENRY J. BROWNE, *Cathedral College, New York*

Historians are wary of surveys of neatly packaged periods of time such as the decade. However, an attempt to survey progress in the field of American Catholic history might be excused if it settled on the period of the last ten years. There are two reasons for this decision. First, it was just ten years ago that the late Thomas F. O'Connor in his presidential address to the American Catholic Historical Association spoke on trends and what, for some unexplained reason, he called ominously "portents" in the writing of American Catholic history. We have, therefore, in his remarks some mark from which to judge forward movement.¹ The second reason for restricting an examination of this matter to the last decade is that the year 1946 marked the first formal entrance of John Tracy Ellis into the circle of historians of American Catholicism.

Since the arrival of this medievalist turned modern historian in the field ten years ago, it has become very much of an Ellisian field. The first doctoral dissertations under the now Monsignor Ellis' guidance appeared that year as did his monograph on the beginnings of the Catholic University of America.² Since then his contributions have been without equal, a widely applauded biography of the leading personage of the late nineteenth century American Church, a selective bibliography, and just in recent months a most useful volume of four essays, and also a book of documents sampling American Catholic history from the sources.³ There have been from his fast typewriter some dozen articles of which two were of more than ordinary significance. These were introductory studies of the American Catholic tradition of the Church-State relationship and of Catholic participation in American scholarship.⁴ The latter piece is undoubtedly the most widely read and

discussed article ever written in the field.

The decade just passed in American Catholic history came under the influence of Ellis also through his students. The emphasis on nineteenth century episcopal biography and on the problems of the 1880's and 1890's which marks the writings in the field cannot be divorced from the fact that five of his doctoral candidates have completed or are working on such biographies — not to mention several master's theses — and that about as much study as will ever be done on them was done on secret societies, the Knights of Labor, and the German question by others in his seminar.⁵ It was to be expected that the post Civil War period so uncultivated up to that time should have beckoned for consideration. The criss-crossing of it through problem studies and episcopal lives now has given every new approach to it a familiar look. It may be said that for whatever complexity of reasons hardly any half important bishop of the last century has remained safe from researchers if he left even a remnant of an archive.

This zeal for the episcopal biography has been an outstanding characteristic of the period coming to a close. It has more often been concerned with the bishops with the big national problems to face and with the consequently heavier archives. These have been found predominantly enough in the late century so as to leave an impression sometimes that none were of consequence between Carroll and Gibbons. These subjects have not included the so-called conservatives nor on too many occasions the unpublicized pastoral immigrant - caring type of Neumann in Philadelphia.⁶ Perhaps this emphasis has been as much a reflection on our own day of centralized episcopal authority as any balanced evaluation of

the importance of the figure of the bishop in the nineteenth century American Church. The fact remains, nonetheless, that such studies are an effective way of plowing up the sources for other more realistic approaches to history. Some straw-in-the-wind significance may be seen in the new policy of the *Dictionary of American Biography*, which does not automatically include every Catholic bishop as worthy of an article.

In the light of the above, a criticism made ten years ago can now be considered valid no longer, namely, that American ecclesiastical biography is being done by amateurs and edifiers. The criticism that lingers despite studies of a few like Patrick Donahoe and James McMaster is the old reflection that the part of the laity has been neglected.⁷ It may happen that the now increasing interest in the theological position and spirituality of the layman may result in more scholarly historical interest not only in famous laymen (Brownson has already led the way) but also in organized lay activities such as the American Federation of Catholic Societies (1901-1917) and its constituent fraternal brotherhoods and in whole historical streams such as the contribution of the American Catholic laywoman.

The amateur historiographer, it would seem, has passed further off the scene in the writing of the histories of religious communities and other local Catholic history. Women religious trained in history have been much in evidence in the last decade, telling with detail but more soberly than before the stories of foundresses and American foundations. The practically brand new field of priestly memoirs has begun to attract contributors and will undoubtedly challenge the verifying efforts of historians yet to come.⁸ Perhaps one of the best inspirations for the treatment of a religious founder was that of Father McSorley, who in writing of Father Hecker plainly delineated the circle of his close friends.⁹ The inauguration or renewal of community historiography in recent years by such

men as Ralph Bayard of the Vincentians, Michael J. Curley of the Redemptorists, Francis X. Curran of the Jesuits, and Vincent Holden of the Paulists is indicative of great progress.

A similar enthusiasm — but always with the reservation that much remains to be done — might be expressed about the regional approach to the history of American Catholicism. It has been argued that the legal but artificial unit of the diocese is not the logical one for the treatment of the Church in a given area. Such an organizational approach tends to play down the natural territorial unity and hence the geographical, economic and sociological picture is distorted. Nonetheless, at least half a dozen diocesan studies (notably those of Detroit and Brooklyn) have appeared in the period under consideration.¹⁰ They have given evidence of an awareness of secular background and of an increasingly professional approach. Similarly the number and background and type of parish histories seem to have been "upgraded" in respectability although the souvenir booklet continues to serve the occasion of anniversaries in most places. Perhaps the best indication of the improved lot of local Catholic history can be found in the acceptance of articles on subjects of that category by the state historical magazines. As a group those secular publications have done more in the past decade for local ecclesiastical history than any Catholic agencies specifically dedicated to the service of that same cause. This phenomenon, which was noticeable everywhere except in the South, may be an example of Catholic integration into the life of the local communities.

A criticism of American Catholic historiography made ten years ago would seem still to stand, namely, the limitation of it to the externals of the life of the Church. Here progress may be measured by goals still to be attained as well as by the point from which there has been movement. Among the slight evidences of gain were studies of the notions of slavery of Archbishop Francis Patrick Ken-

rick and of the apologetics of Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, both done by candidates for the doctorate in theology.¹¹ Another neglected area now demanding greater study among all American religious groups is that of public philanthropy. A notable Catholic beginning, but that is all, has been made in the two volume history of the St. Vincent de Paul Society.¹² Little more than a plea has been made toward a study of the devotional life of American Catholics including its Marian expressions. Even American liturgical traditions do not seem to have received the treatment commensurate with the modern interest in the liturgical revival.¹³ Students of the contemporary relations of Protestants and Catholics have found little serious historical research to fall back upon. American Catholic intellectual interests and their development in our past have hardly been more than alluded to in research. Minor study on Catholic reaction to the evolution controversy seems to have been the sum of progress in studying Catholic thought on pressing problems of the American past.¹⁴ The sources of American canon law have come into use in the last decade but even the prize topic of a real history of the Third Plenary Council continues to go abegging. Little of a serious nature has been added in the area of educational history apart from the four volumes on the early history of the Catholic University of America and four studies on Church-State relations in the field of education.¹⁵ The doors of the archives of our educational institutions, even where a light has been put over them, have not exactly been pounded down by researchers. Furthermore, few influential priests have been saved from historical oblivion. John A. Ryan and Peter E. Dietz have been in part, but what of a Louis Lambert, apologist, a John Zahm, scientist, a John Talbot Smith, writer, a John Burke, first executive Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, or a John Wynne, editor and promoter of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, to mention some of national importance whose papers have not yet been destroyed by

the passage of time, or at the hands of men?¹⁶ There has not even been the dream of regional biographical dictionaries of priests or of what to do with the unwritten documentary relics of the past that demand scientific museum service or monument treatment. The American Catholic past remains unsearched by the methods of genealogy or of statistics, or, still practically speaking, of archeology. Even the scientific publication of documents in the past decade was to all intents and purposes restricted to the Spanish Southwest and the German Midwest.¹⁷

Yet if an overall simplification might be attempted regarding American Catholic historiography in the ten years just past it might be that it has been too source-centered. Apart from the articles of Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C., in the *Review of Politics* especially, interpretation has been at a minimum.¹⁸ Furthermore, not always the most interesting nor the most important but the most readily done subjects have been prominent. The extent and intensity of treatment has likewise often reflected merely the amount of source materials. These sources available, particularly in archives, have given certain areas of the field priority. Hence some of the press, ephemeral published materials, and secular sources have been given secondary consideration in the search for topics. Nationality and language consideration may offer further explanation for the vast untouched questions involving Poles, Italians, French-Canadians and even the Germans. Only the first of those mentioned, whose *Polish American Studies* began in 1944, seem to be making scholarly progress in their own history. The Irish in America have picked up a few researchers dedicated to them but have fallen behind in organized activity. Sources ordinarily do not fall into stories of movements and trends and influences, and so it will remain for the historians to come to look over the whole nineteenth century American Church under many different

aspects not yet attempted. They will undoubtedly use Ellis as many in this day have used Shea and Guilday, as guides to be thanked, but at times to be ignored or even corrected. The immediately future historian, if one may hazard a guess, may have to stay a while in the nineteenth century. The use of documents even of the early years of this century from ecclesiastical archives has been noted even by historian reviewers as somewhat bold. No one need then be surprised by a non-professional reaction from ecclesiastical administrators who may think of 1900 or at best 1918 as the threshold of silence.

The last quality which O'Connor noted in American Catholic historiography ten years ago was the decrease in Catholic historical writing produced for the conscious purpose of edification. It can truthfully be said that this has become now completely unfashionable in American Catholic historical circles. This is not to say that regional, organizational, temperamental and other preferences do not shine through even the most "objective" and "definitive" productions in the field, but certainly the fear of painting warts has vanished. An interesting thing is that all this frankness in ecclesiastical history has hardly won notable secular plaudits. On the contrary, there seems to continue some suspicion of Catholic historiography as propaganda with but an external show of scholarship, because of the presence of the *imprimatur* on so many of its products.

An interesting study might be made of just how much influence the efforts at telling the American Catholic story have had on the general portrayal of the history of the United States and of the universal Church. In the former case it would seem to be very little. *The Harvard Guide*, for example, does not even list Ellis' bibliography although it has the Gibbons and twenty-one other items, with seven of them heavily weighing the selections toward the problems of 1865-1900. In recent

years many older Catholic studies with a too strictly religious interpretation of nativism have been used by secular scholars to reinterpret that phase of our national experience in terms of economics, the slavery controversy, or nationalism.¹⁹ On the other hand, even the much explored Brownson could not fight his way into general volumes on the literary history of the country. Only an occasional college text covers more than the usual paragraphs on Catholics, namely, the Jesuits' missions, nativism, and the campaigns of 1884 and 1928. Perhaps Catholic isolationism is partly to blame. No national historical magazine apart from *American Quarterly* carried an article on American Catholic history in the past decade. From the point of view of universal Church History it may be noted that several doctorates on American subjects were accepted in Rome, a scholarly and competent German survey of the history of the Church in the United States appeared in Europe, and the treatment of that topic in the second volume of the nineteenth century section of the Fliche-Martin series was a vast improvement on what appeared in the former one.²⁰ These may be taken as evidences of a beginning of the bridging of a scholarly gap as real as the one between the Catholic Church and the secular historian in this country. In both cases consciences might be examined as to how well studies in American ecclesiastical history are spread about and particularly reprints from Catholic journals made available to the general run of American and Church historians, even personally, as well as through the pertinent libraries.

The matter of facilities for scholarship in this field should lead to the immediate recognition of great advances even in a decade. The number of archivist servants of research has increased and Catholic college library awareness of the importance of historical manuscript materials has made some advances. The fact remains, however, that no real modern guide to the

holdings of any ecclesiastical archives or manuscript depository is readily available—except that for the Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, another debt to Monsignor Ellis.²¹ Some are known from brief or popular descriptions, others remain known by word of mouth, and a few are deep dark secrets.

More obvious progress has probably been made in library facilities. Yet the first tool of a better critical and perhaps cooperative bibliography might be attempted annually than is now available. One might well wonder why there does not appear somewhere in the United States an annual bibliography in all fields of Church History. O'Connor decried the lack of an adequate and distinguished collection of national scope which now it would seem the Catholic University of America has since systematically built up at least in the book area. Four additional features of that program in Washington which have been stimulated by librarian Eugene Willging deserve mention. In cooperation with Woodstock College a systematic gathering up of conciliar and synodal materials from all over the country was completed. Library science students have been working on decade by decade lists of Catholic publications in the United States, and also on bibliographies of outstanding university past personnel such as William J. Kerby, and Richard Purcell. More important perhaps for the researchers of the future is the project already under way for several years of describing and locating the files of all American Catholic papers and periodicals of the last century. It should not be overlooked at this point that the last ten years have witnessed the reorganizing of the riches of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. These books and newspapers (the latter unsurpassed as a collection for the late nineteenth century) have been housed and serviced at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, due especially to the efforts of Reverend Bartholomew Fair.

By way of recommendation for the future in this regard it might

simply be pointed out that the archives of Irish mission-sending colleges are just about to be tapped and those of mission aid societies on the continent which cover so completely our nineteenth century history have been but sampled and the Roman archives (apart from some of religious communities) have been merely sniffed.²² It is no new suggestion that an American institute in Rome to aid research in this field could be found very useful. The sources there will be the mainstay for the documentary revisionist of the American Catholic history of today, for they have been little used for the latter part of the last century and inadequately handled even for the earlier periods. In these expensive matters the spirit of cooperation inherent in it, and perhaps again the very leadership of the American Catholic Historical Association should be utilized. The same spirit of intelligent and even self-denying cooperation might be pleaded for in the further task of gathering into institutional collections the Catholic historical manuscript material still in inaccessible hiding places.

In facing the problem of imparting the historical knowledge gathered and put together by research another form of cooperation is occasionally advocated, that is, the publishing of a suitable text book in American Catholic history. The hope for such a volume done by one or a group characterized the responses of those who teach Church History in the major seminaries and who graciously responded to a summertime question with the zeal of people never bothered by survey makers. Such a book will be coming from the desk of Monsignor Ellis within a relatively short time, if one can judge by his adherence to past promised schedules. The present situation is dramatized by the fact that of the total of thirty-six professors giving the course, eighteen of them, or fifty per cent, found refuge in Roemer's very inadequate text. Although there is little information from the past to judge it against the present, attention to American Catholic History in semi-

naries is an encouraging sign. Most of the men involved are not trained explicitly in the field but most seem to have had some professional background and have obviously been impressed by the vigorous historiography in this phase of ecclesiastical history. In time it may be expected that the seminaries with their introductory courses will stimulate the new workers in the field. The great majority of the courses are given to the theologians and twice as many of them are given for one semester than for two. The Archdioceses of Chicago and Newark are distinguished by and deserving of commendation for the special consideration given to the history of the Church in their own geographic areas. Nineteen seminaries responded that the American Church history amounted only to the usual few lectures in the general course. It can be thus seen that some two-thirds give it special treatment.

On the university level some evidence of the study of the history of American Catholicism may be presented. The return of thirteen questionnaires revealed eight categorical negatives. There was only one explanation from the head of a department who did not believe in church history as such apart from training in theology. In addition to the two year cycle and graduate seminar leading to the master's or doctor's degree at the Catholic University of America, activity elsewhere consists of Xavier University's offering a graduate seminar and an undergraduate survey, Marquette's two-semester graduate course, and Notre Dame's one-semester course. The other Catholic institutions spoke of being in hopes of introducing such an offering in their history department. It should be added that a seminar such as Dr. Aaron Abell's at Notre Dame on American social history has produced four studies by laymen which will soon be published to enrich the field and to broaden what its leader has already contributed through articles on the American Catholic social movement. Another lay professor who on his own has been active in

the area is J. Herman Schauinger of St. Thomas College in St. Paul.²³ The increased interest in the history of the Catholic Church in this country in seminars of secular institutions in the past ten years is evident to anyone in the field who has been a willing victim of brain picking concerning sources or a supplier of bibliographical guidance for a professional colleague anxious to introduce usually something of the American tradition of "liberal Catholicism" into his classes in American social history.²⁴ Strangely enough at the same time it must be admitted that some American Catholic sociological studies have not been marked by an interest in that very same aspect of the past record.

It would be unrealistic to pass over the popular vogue for the story of American Catholicism. Of course, it was Theodore Maynard, who has recently died, to whom the field owed much in this regard. This is a debt that should be recognized no matter how strongly one might have deplored his lack of scholarly habits even as he deplored academic dryness.²⁵ Certainly there would seem to be a change evident in the fact that sermon series, TV sketches, and newspaper columns are regularly devoted to American Catholic history in its many aspects. Even the decorative themes of cathedrals and churches have been affected. Popular courses occasionally appear in adult education programs and to the *Salesianum* of St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, must be added the *Scriptorium* of St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, and other local publications which are devoting more and more space to this history and its sources. St. John's pioneered in giving a semester to college students in the field and similarly Cardinal Hayes High School in New York concludes its three-semester course in American history with a fourth semester for the seniors on American Catholicism. Obviously the select group of those interested, found previously among professionals and descendants of old Catholic families, in the local Catholic historical societies,

has been broadened.

There remains only a brief consideration of the personnel for this study and particularly for research in American Catholic history. A decade ago the inclination was to speak of their loss to scholarship by their being overburdened with teaching or administration. The ten Ph.D.'s, for example, trained by Guilday from 1936 to 1946 have been almost matched by Ellis in the following decade, but the latter produced a Barry and a Melville, whose contributions to the field would seem to indicate that some of the newer scholars are not as afflicted with the old plague or do not succumb as easily to it.²⁶ It must be said too that in recent years there has been a greater tendency to release personnel on a full or part time basis for historical work. It may be suspected that diocesan and community pride may continue to work in this matter to the advantage of historiography.

The future course of scholarship in

this field rests on many unpredictable intangibles. Ten years ago anti-intellectualism and the emphasis on the active, practical, and immediate was considered an obstacle to progress. Such things will always exist to some degree to annoy the historical scholar and to lessen his public or official acclaim. Yet today every respectably produced American Catholic history has a willing and almost anxious audience. Those in the field can assure even greater progress in the decade ahead by the fresh application of their imaginations to the whole record of the Church, by greater and more stimulating contacts with American and ecclesiastical historians, as well as by continued cooperation among themselves in the technicalities of their craft. With a renewed devotion to critical history in writing and teaching they can aid one another to fulfill their academic vocation of putting the American Catholic chapter into the general stream of the American past and into the annals of the universal Church.

*This paper was delivered in its original form before a meeting of the American Historical Association on December 30, 1956 at St. Louis.

1. "Trends and Portents in American Catholic Historiography," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXIII (April, 1947), 3-11.
2. Sister Mary Alphonsine Frawley, *Patrick Donohoe* (Washington, 1946); *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington, 1946).
3. *The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1854-1921* (2 vols., Milwaukee, 1952); *A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1947); *American Catholicism* (Chicago, 1956); *Documents of American Catholic History* (Milwaukee, 1956).
4. "Church and State: An American Catholic Tradition," *Harper's Magazine*, CCVII (November, 1953), 63-67; "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life," *Thought*, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 351-388. This latter article was delivered as a paper at the May, 1955 annual meeting of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, in St. Louis. It subsequently

was printed in whole or in part by Catholic papers and magazines, including a serial reproduction in three parts in the *London Tablet* beginning with the issue of November 17, 1956, and was put into book form by the Heritage Foundation, Chicago, 1956.

5. The published biographies are Sister M. Hildegard Yeager, C.S.C., *The Life of James Roosevelt Boyley, First Bishop of Newark and Eighth Archbishop of Baltimore, 1814-1877* (Washington, 1947); Hugh J. Nolan, *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851* (Washington, 1948); Patrick H. Ahern, *The Life of John J. Keane, Educator and Archbishop, 1839-1918* (Milwaukee, 1955). The two in progress are Martin J. Spalding by Peter Hogan, S.S.J., and John Lancaster Spalding by David Sweeney, O.F.M. The monographs alluded to are Fergus Macdonald, *The Catholic Church and the Secret Societies in the United States* (New York, 1946); Henry J. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington, 1949); Colman J. Barry, O.S.B., *The Catholic Church and German-Americans* (Milwaukee, 1953).
6. The exception is Michael J. Curley,

- C.S.S.R., *Venerable John Neumann, C.S.S.R., Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia* (Washington, 1952).
7. Cf. Frawley, *op. cit.*, and Sister Mary Augustine Kwitche, *James Mc-Master: a Study in American Thought* (Washington, 1949).
 8. Outstanding among these is John La-Farge, S. J., *The Manner is Ordinary* (New York, 1954).
 9. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P., *Father Hecker and His Friends* (St. Louis, 1952).
 10. Cf. George Paré, *The Catholic Church in Detroit, 1701-1888* (Detroit, 1951) and John K. Sharp, *History of the Diocese of Brooklyn, 1853-1953* (New York, 1954).
 11. Joseph D. Brokhage, *Francis Patrick Kenrick's Opinion on Slavery* (Washington, 1955) and Adam A. Micek, *The Apologetics of Martin J. Spalding* (Washington, 1951). To these might be added Bertin Farrell, *Orestes Brownson's Approach to the Problem of God* (Washington, 1950).
 12. Daniel T. McColgan, *A Century of Charity: The First One Hundred Years of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul in the United States* (2 vols., Milwaukee, 1951).
 13. A very recent rectification of this condition is found in Paul Marx, O.S.B., *The Life and Work of Virgil Michel* (Washington, 1957).
 14. Cf. John L. Morrison, "American Catholics and the Crusade against Evolution," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXIV (June, 1953), 59-71.
 15. Over and above Ellis, *Formative Years* there have been Patrick H. Ahern on the history of the university from 1887-1896 (Washington, 1949); Peter Hogan on the period, 1896-1903 (Washington, 1949); and Colman J. Barry, covering the years 1903 to 1909. The other studies were Mark J. Hurley, *Church-State Relationships in Education in California* (Washington, 1948); Edward M. Connors, *Church-State Relationships in Education in the State of New York* (Washington, 1951); Sister Mary Paul Mason, *Church-State Relationships in Education in Connecticut. 1633-1953* (Washington, 1953); Daniel W. Kucera, O. S. B., *Church-State Relationships in Education in Illinois* (Washington, 1955).
 16. Patrick W. Gearty, *The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan* (Washington, 1953), and Mary Harrita Fox, *Peter E. Dietz, Labor Priest* (Notre Dame, 1953).
 17. The former in *Americas* published by the American Academy of Franciscan History and the latter in *Salesianum* from St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee.
 18. Cf., for example, "The Formation of the Catholic Minority in the United States, 1820-1860," *Review of Politics* X (January, 1948), 13-34. These studies will reach their culmination in McAvoy's forthcoming volume on the late century problems of "Americanism."
 19. Cf. Robert Ernst, *Immigrant Life in New York City, 1825-1863* (New York, 1949); W. Darrell Overdyke, *The Know-Nothing Party in the South* (Baton Rouge, 1950); John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Pattern of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New Brunswick, 1955).
 20. Cf. V. J. Feeher, S.V.D., *A Study of the Movement for German National Parishes in Philadelphia and Baltimore 1787-1802* (Rome, 1955); Ludwig Hertling, S. J., *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Berlin, 1954); R. Aubert, *Le pontificat de Pie IX (1846-1878)* (Paris, 1952), 427-436.
 21. "A Guide to the Baltimore Cathedral Archives," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXII (October, 1946), 341-360. Since 1949 the Department of Archives and Manuscripts at the Catholic University of America has institutionalized the servicing of source materials done previously on a personal basis by Ellis and his predecessor, Monsignor Peter Guilday.
 22. Monsignor Ellis has obtained copies of materials from St. Cuthbert College, Ushaw, England, All Hallows, Dublin, and the Archives of the Archdiocese of Dublin. Under Father McAvoy's direction Notre Dame in conjunction with the Historical Commission for the Beatification of Bishop Frederiek Baraga, of which the historian is Joseph Gregorich, has acquired microfilm copies of the American missionaries' letters in the headquarters of the Ludwigs Missionverein of Munich and of the Lyon Council of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith in Fribourg, Switzerland. The materials from the Paris Council of this latter organization have been partly acquired as have those from the Leopoldinen Stiftung of Vienna. Mr. Gregorich has also obtained materials from Yugoslavia and Rome pertaining more specifically to Baraga.
 23. Schauinger's works are *William Gaston, Carolinian* (Milwaukee, 1949), *Cathedrals in the Wilderness* (Milwaukee, 1952), *Stephen T. Badin, Priest in the Wilderness*, (Milwaukee, 1956).
 24. In 1949 a peak appears to have been reached when there were seven doctoral dissertations on American Catholic subjects in progress in the history departments of secular universities.

25. Cf. Henry J. Browne, "Mr. Maynard and 'Popular' American History," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXX (May, 1954), 325-329.
26. To the works of Barry already mentioned must be added *Worship and Work. St. John's Abbey and University 1856-1956* (Collegeville, 1956). Cf.

Annabelle Melville, *Elisabeth Bayley Seton, 1774-1821* (New York, 1951), and John Carroll of Baltimore, *Founder of the American Hierarchy* (New York, 1955). Also forthcoming from Melville is a life of John Cheverus, first Bishop of Boston.

DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS

"The Early Quaker Outlook upon 'the World' and Society, 1647-1662." By Hugh Barbour (Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana). Yale University, 1952. Director: Roland H. Bainton.

This thesis attempts to draw together the religious experience and the ethical outlooks of the early Quakers. Each aspect of early Quakerism has been already competently and thoroughly studied, but the selection involved from the great mass of early Quaker writing may have prevented adequate interpretation of the religious roots of the Quaker ethic. From devotional writings, the depth of spiritual life in the Quaker experience of "the Inward Light" has been presented with an emphasis upon mysticism. Social reformers have shown that Quakers, before they withdrew into purified communities attempting only limited programs of social reform, had at first strongly attacked the entire pattern of society, government, church and daily life in Cromwellian England. But attempts to present Friends as proto-socialists fail to reach the roots of this radicalism as widely as do modern liberal Quaker doctrines about the goodness of "that of God" within each man. Radical inward experience produced radical action.

Living in the Puritan period in England, Quakers took over the Puritan sense of ethical struggle and the theocratic approach to society, making both a more radical and a more inward challenge to church and social structure. The Quaker movement arose, however, among the dales and fells of northwestern England in areas where neither Puritan nor Anglican, Jesuit nor Baptist had reached. In this neglected region a tradition of social discontent had persisted among the tenant-farmers, who provided the backbone of early Quaker

membership. From the north-west Quakerism spread in 1654-58 through southwestern England and among the working people in Bristol and London. In all these areas, their mass meetings were often like those of other religious awakenings among the uncultured, the unchurched, and the socially disinherited.

Early Friends commonly passed through intense conversion experiences fostered by fiery Quaker preaching. Bitter personal struggles centering upon conviction of sin lasted for some months before inward peace was reached by self-surrender to the Spirit of God. Friends saw the Spirit manifested simultaneously in the emotional "power" which seized Quakers meeting together, in sudden and specific inward impulses or "leadings" and in the voice of awakened conscience. Implicit obedience to the Spirit was felt to run counter to the wills and reasonings of all men. Expecting the Spirit to give ideas in all subjects and guidance in all actions, Friends were often led to strange conduct, but all aspects of daily life were laid open to religious challenge.

Early Quakers thus expected the power within them to reach all men and radically to transform the world. Like many revival movements, the Friends were millenarian not from despair but from trust that the revolution which had come within themselves would sweep the world without. But this meant inward and outward struggle. While the natural world was accepted as God's good creation and the instrument of God and his saints, "the World" of sinful men was seen as rebelling against God. All human ways and customs were the fruit of self-will. Quakers thus announced "the Lamb's War," against "the World"; the weapons of this war against pride and self-will were suffering and prophetic preach-

ing. Under the Spirit's leading, victory was certain and would be soon.

The State was approved by early Quakers as God's intended instrument for justice and for reform. Friends' Puritan and theocratic outlook here also implied absolute autonomy for the Spirit. Thus Friends endlessly admonished governments, yet also insisted on religious liberty for all men led (even in part) by the Spirit. Friends also felt justified when led to acts of prophetic judgment which intruded even into the lives of other men. Such religious absolutism creates an impasse. The Quaker solution was creative; by friendship, passive resistance, and the renouncing of violence, Friends made possible mutual trust and acceptance where differing beliefs were basic and irreconcilable.

Friends' own social conduct, though it meant withdrawing from impure social customs, was above all a testimony to win other men to obey the light. The rejection of ornate dress and ceremony in speech was an attack upon the human pride which enjoys luxury and superiority. Oaths and bargaining were rejected as challenges to the dishonesty of "the World." Even positive programs for mutual aid and legal reform showed concern for all suffering men.

Persecutions in England from 1662 into the 1680's made Quakers gradually give up the expectation of world conquest. Survival was the victory. The leadings of the Light became the customs of a limited sect. But positive relationships with the non-Quaker world remained. William Penn and others worked for limited reforms, appealing on the basis of common human reason and the human conscience made sacred in themselves. The "Lamb's War" gave way to social relativism and the acceptance of the secular world.

"Hosea Ballou, Preacher of Universal Salvation." By Ernest Casarsa. Boston University, 1957. Director: Edwin Booth.

Hosea Ballou (1771-1852) was the

most prominent of the leaders of American Universalism. No study of his life and thought has been published since 1889; there has never been a careful examination of his thought, nor has there been any attempt to trace it to its sources.

Ballou, the son of a poor Calvinist Baptist preacher, was converted to Universalism and began preaching the new "heresy" on a Calvinistic basis in 1791. Such passages as Romans 5:18, he believed, demonstrated the truth of the doctrine that all men had been condemned in Adam, all were saved in Christ.

Between 1791 and 1795 Ballou's thought went through a radical transformation as the result of his reading of Ethan Allen's deistical work, *Reason the Only Oracle of Man*. Allen destroyed Ballou's faith in the doctrines of the trinity and the divinity of Christ, the infinity of sin, and the traditional theories of atonement. But Ballou did not follow Allen and the Deists in their rejection of Biblical revelation. With the help of Charles Chauncy's *Salvation of All Men*, which justified not only his belief in Universal Salvation but also helped him to substitute the Arian for the trinitarian view of Christ, and to view the atonement as the reconciliation of man to God and not vice versa; and Ferdinand Olivier Petitpierre's *Thoughts on Divine Goodness*, which helped him to see Christ's atonement as an expression of God's love, and also gave him a firm base for a theory of determinism;—Ballou began the reconstruction of his religious thought.

His first sermon on a unitarian and Arian base was preached in 1795. Within ten years, through the power of his argumentation, and against the opposition of the prominent Universalist John Murray, Ballou had converted the Universalist ministry to unitarianism. In 1805 his new thought was fully systematized in *A Treatise on Atonement*, a brilliant piece of reasoning and debate expressed in the language of rural America.

Ballou's Arian view of Christ even-

tually gave way to the Socinian view, probably under the influence of the writings of the English Unitarian Joseph Priestley.

In 1817 Ballou began a ministry of almost thirty-five years in Boston, where his vigorous preaching and argumentation was responsible for a rapid growth of Universalism.

Although he was a unitarian long before the Unitarian movement began, Ballou was not welcomed by that group which, for social and doctrinal reasons, shied away from association with the Universalists. This dissertation compares the thought of Ballou with that of William Ellery Channing, the most effective spokesman of the Unitarians, on vital issues between the two denominations.

Whereas in the early days Uni-

versalists had been content to oppose the orthodox on the basis of a limited future punishment, in 1817 Ballou concluded that no future punishment could be demonstrated from the Scripture. He took the Old Testament attitude that man is punished in this life for his transgressions. His new views were partially responsible for the Restorationist Controversy in the denomination.

Hosea Ballou's effect on the rise of American religious liberalism was great. His vigorous preaching was responsible for the rapid spread of liberal religious thought among the lower classes. He was responsible for the conversion of Universalism to a unitarian base, a reasonable theory of atonement, and for warming the heart of the God of Calvinism.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die Heilige Schrift im Kampf der griechischen Kirche gegen die Astrologie. By UTTO RIEDINGER. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1956. 216 pp.

This dissertation deals with the exegesis of the Greek Fathers from Origen to John of Damascus. The first part contains a discussion of the passages in their writings which treat of astrology; the second, of the sections of the Old and New Testaments for which they provide exegesis, and of the biblical personages involved. Because Fr. Riedinger begins with Origen, we miss a discussion of the significance of astrology in Ignatius and in gnosticism. Such a discussion might have given more life to a dissertation which, while full of interesting materials, somehow fails to make the issues clear—partly because the philosophical questions had already been handled by Dom Amand in his important *Fatalisme et Liberté dans l'antiquité grecque* (Louvain, 1945).

R. M. GRANT

University of Chicago

De Spiritu Sancto, Der Beitrag des Basilius zum Abschluss des trinitarischen Dogmas. By HERMANN DÖRRIES. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Dritte Folge, No. 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. 199 pp.

Some of the most influential books in the history of the Church arose casually in response to a particular circumstance. Basil lived in an era when one could not go for a haircut or a bath without precipitating a theological controversy and when particularly any variation in the liturgy might occasion a riot. Basil was confronted with the demand for a clarification because he was willing in the Doxology to sing "Glory be to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Ghost" or to sing "Glory be to the Father through the Son and in the Holy Ghost." He de-

fended both of these expressions on the ground that, if we think of the greatness of the nature of the Only Begotten, we should say "and the Son;" but, if we think of his gifts, we say "through the Son." The debate here is primarily with regard to the prepositions to be used as to the "Son."

A more acrimonious controversy arose in the case of the "Spirit." Eunomios and the Arian opponents of Basil declared that since the Son is only begotten, the Spirit is not begotten and must therefore be a creature, subordinate to the Father. Basil was clearer as to what he would not say than as to what he would declare. All agreed that the Son is only begotten. Therefore the Spirit cannot be begotten, but the Spirit, said Basil, is not a creature and is not subordinate. Neither is the Spirit a mode of God's activity without any sort of differentiation within the being of God. The Spirit is not a Neoplatonic emanation welling up within the impersonal being of God. Basil held strongly to the Hebrew tradition of God as transcendent, creating and personal. But how then is the Spirit to be interpreted? The answer is not so easy to give with regard to so ineffable a mystery, but the works of the Spirit in baptism and notably in the monastic life are the demonstration for Basil that the Spirit is God at work. One wonders whether the Sabellian formula would not have expressed this affirmation had it not been that Sabellianism had been so decisively condemned in the case of the doctrine of the Son. The contention is that the Cappadocians rather than Athanasius rounded out the trinitarian doctrine.

The fourth century is the period in which the works of no Church Father are uncompassable and Professor Dörries with his accustomed thoroughness examines every shred of evidence and reconstructs conclusively the arguments used by the opponents of Basil.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Yale Divinity School

Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesis of Emesa. Edited by WILLIAM TELFER. Vol. IV of the Library of Christian Classics. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 446 pp. \$5.00.

The first half of this volume contains an introductory essay on St. Cyril and the Church of Jerusalem, then selections from Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*, and thirdly his little known but interesting letter to the Emperor Constantius. The *Mystagogic Lectures* traditionally attributed to him are not dealt with. It is the introduction that will particularly interest scholarly readers, for in it Canon Telfer undertakes no less than a reappraisal of the whole place of Jerusalem in Early Church History. He argues that in spite of the destruction of the ancient city, the Christian community kept its continuity and its awareness of the sacredness of the place. The local pre-Nicene doctrinal tradition—conservative but quite orthodox—is, he maintains, the tradition expounded and preserved by Cyril. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre, where Cyril's lectures were delivered and to which he often refers, is described and its archeology discussed in a brief but masterful manner. A generation ago, critical historians dismissed the traditional identification of Our Lord's tomb as fanciful. Telfer effectively shows, however, that there are strong arguments in favor of the tradition, and very little against it.

Canon Telfer's conclusions certainly deserve the serious consideration of historically conscious Christians. As the war clouds once again gather around Sion, it is important that we ask ourselves what attitude, if any, the modern Christian should have toward that place which is in such a unique sense the Mother of Christendom.

As to the handling of the texts, the comments and annotations are on the whole excellent. It is unfortunate, however, that the editor gives the reader no idea of how important these lectures are for the history of the Creed.

The second part of the volume is devoted to Nemesis' *Treatise on the Nature of Man*. Telfer here gives us

the complete work in the first translation from the Greek ever to be published in English. The treatise is an exposition of the Christian doctrine of man, and had a wide influence in ancient and mediaeval times, when it was frequently attributed to St. Gregory of Nyssa. Its curious and complicated literary history is dealt with at length in the introduction. Nemesis is notable for his preoccupation with scientific questions, and his extensive knowledge of contemporary medicine. This treatise is in fact primarily important for medical history. For the ecclesiastical historian, it provides interesting browsing, and reveals an aspect of patristic thought about which we would otherwise know virtually nothing.

H. BOONE PORTER, JR.
Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin

Magistri Johannis Hus Tractatus de ecclesia. Edited by S. HARRISON THOMSON. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1956. xxxiv, 251 pp. \$6.00.

John Hus' major theological work, the *De ecclesia*, was of great interest to his judges at Constance and to his own followers in Bohemia. In the following century it showed the German Protestants that they were "all Hussites without knowing it," at least in some respects, and accordingly received three editions from them: two in 1520 and one in 1558. In all three Hus' latinity was improved according to humanist standards. Subsequently interest faded and no new edition was published, although that of 1558 was reprinted in 1583 and again in 1715. Modern scholarship has studied the work chiefly in this 1715 edition, which in fact provided the text for the only translation into a major language—David S. Schaff's English translation of 1915. Only now, however, with Dr. Thomson's scientific edition, can the *De ecclesia* be given the systematic study that it deserves, as an expression of Hus' thought, as part of the intellectual universe of Hussite Bohemia, and as part of the whole European intellectual movement

of the later Middle Ages.

The present edition itself constitutes a great step forward on these paths of study. Besides offering a text established by collation of all important manuscript versions and early printed editions, and besides providing indices of proper names, subjects, and scriptural citations, it gives an excellent account of the origin and early history of the work, and it systematically attacks the key problem of identifying Hus' own sources. Of these the most important group, apart from standard scriptural, patristic, and canonistic sources, consists of the works of John Wyclif. Since Dr. Thomson, like Hus, is an eminent student of Wyclif, he has been able to note many hitherto unnoted cases in which the Czech reformer used the Englishman as a source of ideas or as a source of other authorities. A few other such borrowings, including some from Marsilius of Padua, are also noted. This process of charting out the intellectual currents of the later Middle Ages has only begun in modern times, and the present edition will doubtless play an important role in it.

Those interested simply in reading the *De ecclesia* will doubtless continue to use the Schaff translation, both for convenience and for its wealth of background material (which Dr. Thomson does not duplicate). But all serious work with Hus' great treatise will henceforth be based on Dr. Thomson's edition.

HOWARD KAMINSKY
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

The Byzantine Background to the Italian Renaissance. By KENNETH M. SETTON. Philadelphia: Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Volume 100, No. 1, 1956. 76 pp.

Professor Setton has produced in remarkably brief compass an extremely informative article which deals with two aspects of the same problem—the first, the presence of the Greeks in Italy; and the second, the relations between Italy and Byzantium up to the time of the Renaissance. He points out that there is no difficulty at all in

demonstrating that the Greeks have been in Southern Italy from before the Christian era to the present day and there are now in the area of Otranto as many as 16,000 persons who speak Greek. At certain periods the Greek of Calabria was preferred by the Italians and by the English to that of Athens or Constantinople. The only problem here is as to whether the Greek colonies in Southern Italy were unbroken in their continuity. We have records of decline and of repletion through new immigrations. An absolute continuity is difficult to demonstrate, but the evidence here gathered points in that direction.

The other part of the study has to do with the relations between Italy and Constantinople; and these were much more intimate than one is inclined to suppose who has been told that after the Photian schism the East and the West mutually looked upon each other as Samaritans. All in all, this is a highly instructive study.

ROLAND H. BAINTON
Yale Divinity School

The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation. By E. HARRIS HARBISON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. xii, 177 pp. \$3.00.

"The Reformation was," says the author, "to a large extent a learned movement." Its era was one in which the prestige and influence of Christian scholars "reached a height not before attained." Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin are the scholars specifically described (Chapters III-V). The author begins by determining what Christian scholarship is. This is not done by mere theorizing, but rather by historical examples. Thus in Chapter I the author takes up Jerome, Augustine, Abelard, and Thomas Aquinas; in Chapter II, Petrarch, Valla, G. Pico della Mirandola, and Colet. It would be difficult to make better choices. In the very beginning, Tertullian's celebrated sentence is quoted about the incompatibility of Athens with Jerusalem, which might have opened the way for a chapter on Christian scholarship in the age of the Apologists. But

the aim is to define the subject, not to give a general history of it. The inclusion of Abelard, Petrarch, Valla, and Pico is heartening; it reveals a broad view of the Christian scholar. I can imagine that it cost some struggle to eliminate Le Fèvre and Reuchlin. However, it was much better to use the space for three Italian humanists, if for no other reason than to help shorten the distance in some minds between humanists and Reformers.

A certain over-all interest and unity is given the book by the thread of inquiry as to how one can be both a scholar and a Christian at the same time. The results are variegated. Some seem hardly aware of this question; at the other extreme are those who ask it anxiously. Though it is not said in so many words, it is implied that the question is endemic to a religion of revelation, an opinion for which it is not hard to find copious documentation. In this connection the author advances a somewhat novel view of Calvin's solution for the question of the coexistence of the scholar and the Christian in him. Calvin had wanted to lead the quiet scholarly life, but God called him to the active life of a Reformer. Thus he was a "god-frustrated scholar" (p. 144). The continued attractions of scholarship, to which he could not but yield, gave him a "sense of guilt" (p. 163). The guilty feeling was replaced by his belief that "scholarship could be a Christian vocation of high significance." This meant that "scholarship for its own sake, reading and writing for the sheer fun of it, could never be justified." Only that could stand the Christian test which was "sensitive to human needs, relevant to social ills, productive of Christian piety, etc." This is indeed an interesting idea. It seems certain that Calvin's view of truth was rather heavily dyed with utility, which doubtless accounts for his stress on truth as an active force in life. As to his feeling of guilt about truth for truth's sake or as an object of contemplation, that is another matter. And as to this feeling of guilt being assuaged by aiming at usefulness, that is still another matter. But the evidence

is given too little space. I hope the writer will some day give a full account of the matter.

Christian scholarship in the period of the Renaissance and especially of the Reformation bears the images of Jerome the linguist and grammarian, and of Augustine who was introspective, a seeker after certainty, a speculative thinker. Jerome represented the philological approach to Scripture, and Erasmus idealizes him. Augustine represents the inspirational approach, and he is idealized by Luther. (See W. Schwartz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and their Background*, Cambridge University Press, 1955, Chapters II, IV-VI, passim. Valuable as a supplement to Professor Harbison's book.) Our author says that both approaches "could coexist" in Calvin (p. 152). Augustine long had bitter suspicions of Jerome's approach, as did Luther of Erasmus'. It is the distinction of Calvin that he tried to combine both.

Professor Harbison has given us an excellent little book. It helps to open up a field in which doctoral candidates can find dissertation topics for years to come. It could be profitably used as a guide for study groups in churches. Laymen will enjoy its fresh, informal style; and scholars will find much suggestion for further research in the notes.

QUIRINUS BREEN

University of Oregon

The Complete Writings of Menno Simons (c. 1496-1561). Translated from the Dutch by Leonard Verduin and edited by John Christian Wenger, with a biography by Harold S. Bender. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1956. Illustrated. 1092 pp. \$8.75.

Menno Simons wrote numerous devotional, doctrinal and controversial treatises for the Protestant minority group, known as Anabaptists or Mennonites, located in The Netherlands and North Germany. The writings appeared in a language reflecting his surroundings in Groningen, East

Friesland, etc. Gradually, they were collected for publication in the literary Dutch language (1600-01, 1646, 1681), in the German language (1876-81, 1926) and in the English language (1876-81, 1956). Selections from his writings, particularly the *Foundation Book*, appeared in numerous editions. In *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons* published in 1956 full use has been made of the recently discovered writings which K. Vos published in his biography of *Menno Simons* (Leiden, 1914). Thirty-four of the 1,092 pages consist of new material. Although this edition is the most complete thus far published it must be said that Menno Simons intentionally omitted some items from his *Foundation Book* of 1539 in later editions which could easily have been included in this edition. Scripture references found in previous editions have been reduced considerably.

Leonard Verduin of Ann Arbor, Michigan, translated the writings of Menno. Great improvements are noticeable in comparison with the 1871 English edition. The sentence construction has been simplified. There are evidences that this new edition comes closer to the original. And yet large sections of the two versions show great similarity which would make it more appropriate to call this new edition "a new revised version" rather than an entirely new translation. J. C. Wenger edited the manuscript, wrote an introduction for each writing, described the content, named the occasion which prompted it, added footnotes and prepared the index. These aids prove to be very helpful, particularly for the layman. The title above the text of each writing is abbreviated and the complete translated title appears in the introduction stating where this writing can be found in the Dutch *Opera* of 1681 and *Complete Works* of 1871. The original Dutch title is never given. More references to the sources from which the editor obtained his information would have been beneficial. The comprehensive index of over a thousand items is very helpful

for the average reader, but the scholar will have to do some additional solid reading. The biography of Menno Simons by H. S. Bender, also published previously, which precedes the writings, presents the main facts in a concise form (26 pages). A number of typographical errors (p. 24, the date 1552 should be 1554; p. 25, 1533 should be 1553; p. 28, the first 1533 should be 1553) and a few statements, such as that "quite early the parents of Menno Simons decided to consecrate their son to the service of the church" (p. 4) and that Menno spent "seven years of labor in The Netherlands" (pp. 16, 18) are not in agreement with recent findings.

The translator, the editor and publishers must be congratulated on the achievement of making this modern edition available to the English reading public. The next task should be to think in terms of preparing a scholarly edition of the original Dutch writings of Menno Simons. Unfortunately this task remained unfinished when Samuel Cramer and F. Pijper published the ten volumes of the *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*. European American scholars should unite to accomplish this task.

CORNELIUS KRAHN

Bethel College
North Newton, Kansas.

Georg Spalatin: Ein Leben in der Zeit des Humanismus und der Reformation. By IRMGARD HÖSS. Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1956. xvi, 467 pp. DM 27.

This lengthy German biography of Georg Spalatin (1484-1545) is an excellent presentation of the man and his role in the Reformation. While Spalatin could hardly be classed as one of the most significant men of the time, he is by no means unimportant, for he was directly involved in the great religious, humanistic and political movements of his day. Unfortunately Spalatin has been neglected not only because he has been overshadowed by Luther and Melancthon but also because his works have not been generally avail-

able. While many of Spalatin's writings, particularly his letters, still remain uncollected and unedited, the author of this biography has brought together the researches and interpretations of Spalatin over the past four centuries and has added much new material laboriously gleaned from more than thirty archives in Europe. The author freely admits his indebtedness to previous writers such as Müller, Berbig, Engelhardt, Gillert, etc., while at the same time critically appraising and correcting their views. He succeeds in presenting Spalatin as an interesting actor on the Reformation stage, as one who despite his political activity and humanistic tendencies never left the "soil of Christianity."

With the exception of the last chapter which is a brief discussion of Spalatin's theology and world view, the book is organized around four periods in Spalatin's life: the years of his youth and early education, 1484-1505; the years of his tutoring and increasing importance as a scholar and counselor in the Saxon court, 1505-1516; the climax years when he was secretary and advisor to Elector Frederick the Wise, 1516-1525; and the years when he was involved in establishing the new church, 1525-1545. The year 1525 is fixed upon as the great dividing line in Spalatin's life for in this year he took up a pastorate at Altenburg and became directly connected with the religious movement. Although he did not live at court after 1525, he continued to advise the electors of Saxony at the diets and other official meetings. Even the Roman Catholics recognized his strategic position and sought to woo him. Spalatin's attempts to curb some of Luther's rashness and his great fondness for peace should not be taken as signs of timidity, or as a proneness to do business with the papacy, or as a holdover of humanism in opposition to the evangelical faith, but rather as the wisdom of a man with definite religious convictions and an understanding of the ways of politics.

A very valuable chapter is devoted

to Spalatin's visitation work between 1527 and 1529, also a chapter to his work while Luther was at the Wartburg, and a full chapter to the years of tension between 1522 and 1525 when Spalatin departed from the papacy. The question about the legitimacy of Spalatin's birth, his wedding, the controversy over the right of a priest to marry, the final years of peace, etc., serve to illuminate not only his private life but his theological commitments.

It is unfortunate that this work is in German, for this will prevent a very wide reading in this country of a biography which brings new insights into the life of a key Reformation figure.

CLYDE MANSCHRECK

Duke University

Old Priest and New Presbyterian.
By NORMAN SYKES. New York:
Cambridge University Press, 1956.
viii, 266 pp. \$5.00.

Every participant in ecumenical discourse dealing with problems of Faith and Order knows from experience that, if a representative of Anglicanism shares in the debate, the conversation will, sooner or later, come to a halt before the Protestant-Catholic chasm symbolized by Anglicanism's apparently incurable obsession with episcopal church order. Even the most irenic of Anglican spokesmen seems to become hard of heart if he is asked to envisage a plan for a reunion of the churches in which acceptance of the historic episcopate should be omitted. Yet when asked to produce a clearly defined doctrine of apostolic succession, the Anglican spokesman, unless he adheres to a party within his church like the one deriving from the Oxford Movement of a hundred years ago, halts and stumbles. The non-Anglican inquirer may well be puzzled.

The questioner must turn to Anglicanism's history for a clue to the puzzle. He will find in the book under review a masterly survey of Anglicanism's long wrestling with the meaning of its inherited catholic church order. Dr. Sykes has produced what

may well be, for the proximate future at least, the definitive exposition of Anglicanism's stubborn adherence to episcopacy as a polity to be accepted in practice (*ad agenda*) as also of its reluctance to incorporate a dogma of apostolic succession into a confession of the necessary *credenda* of the Church's faith.

Dr. Sykes' survey covers the centuries from the Elizabethan Settlement to the latest contemporary schemes of reunion (the Church of South India a conspicuous example) which attempt pragmatic solutions to the problem of unifying our varying ministerial orderings within an episcopal polity. Although the Civil War of the Cromwell era widened the gulf between episcopal church order and that of the presbyterian polity of Scotland or that of the free churches at home, Anglicans could never forget the days when the Church of England stood shoulder to shoulder with the Protestant churches of the continent in their revolt from Rome, when as exiles under Mary and again under the reign of the Puritans they accepted hospitality at Protestant altars, and when the failure of the churches of the continent to regularize their ministerial orderings under the rule of bishops could receive the charitable explanation of their having acted under the compulsion of necessity. The judicial verdict of Launcelot Andrewes, possibly the most trusted of high-church Caroline divines, has become classic: "If our form be of divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is no salvation without it, or that a church cannot consist without it. He is blind who doth not see churches consisting without it." (Sykes, page 74.)

In the judgment of this reviewer, the most valuable chapter in Dr. Sykes' volume is the last — "Via Media: A Moderate Imparity" — in which he pleads precisely for a return by Anglicans, in our contemporary ecumenical era, to Anglicanism's traditional pragmatic approach to ecclesiological doctrine. Attempts to

fasten upon Anglicanism a dogma of apostolic succession as being of the *esse* of the Church distort historic Anglicanism itself. "From such an approach the Anglican tradition has been delivered by its tenacious hold upon the historical method . . . Accordingly, the Church of England has never set forth any theological or doctrinal theory of episcopacy, but in its Articles, the Preface to the Ordinal, and the writings of its representative divines has contented itself with a historical statement of its intention to continue the threefold ministry, on the ground of its tradition in the church since the apostolic age . . . The traditional Anglican position in regard to episcopacy therefore commends it on the strength of its long historic continuance since the apostolic age, as being of the *bene* or *plene esse* of the church; and consequently a condition of union of other churches with itself" (pages 244-45).

THEODORE O. WEDEL

College of Preachers
Washington, D. C.

August Hermann Francke, 1663-1727, *Zeuge des lebendigen Gottes*. By ERICH BEYREUTHER. Marburg: Francke-Buchhandlung, 1956. 246 pp. Illustrated. DM 7.40.

Seldom does history afford a better opportunity to study Christian faith in action than in the career of August Hermann Francke. In times like ours, when the nature of this faith is under closest scrutiny, and when its very right to exist is disputed also in Red-dominated Halle, the story of Francke's amazing life reads like a message of hope and encouragement. Not that the 18th century can send one of its gifted sons as a spiritual ambassador to the mid-20th, but that the evidence of what great faith has accomplished in one generation can encourage earnest seekers and emulators in another.

In this spirit Erich Beyreuther, professor of church history at the University of Leipzig, has worked

through the sources and come out with a moving biography of Francke as a "witness of the living God." Erudition and scholarly competence underlie this semi-popular presentation. His style at times suggests that of Van Wyck Brooks; and one could wish, for example, that Beyreuther would have elaborated further also on Francke's contacts with New England's Cotton Mather. But within the confines of 246 pages, the author does a portrait whose lines are drawn with sympathy and satisfaction. Beyreuther is obviously enthusiastic over Francke, and is eager to tell his contemporary Germans, in both East and West, about one of their spiritual forebears whose Christian faith was bound up with a profound sense of social responsibility and purposeful activity. In the process, Beyreuther corrects the caricature from which Francke's kind of piety has suffered, especially since Albrecht Ritschl's *opus magnum* on pietism.

The story of Francke's family background and youth in Luebeck, of his student days, and especially of his memorable conversion, is told with skill and pointed simplicity. The awakening which his exegetical lectures precipitated among the students in Leipzig, and the resulting clash between the new 'pietism' and the Carpovian orthodoxy, provide a close-up of the great divide which Francke deplored and was unable to prevent. His struggles in the Glaucha parish form a prelude for the far happier subject of his marriage to Anna Magdalena von Wurm and their inspired partnership in service, a partnership prodded by the four-dollar gift that launched Francke on his career as educator and provider for more than 3,000 children and university students. So Francke, triumphing over his opposition, became the confident worker of miracles in education and social welfare, in pastoral counseling and in an incredibly far-flung correspondence. His dynamic concern for missions at home and abroad, (in Russia, India, North America, Africa, and elsewhere), supply a vivid introduction to

modern missions and the ecumenical movement.

All these phases, and many others, might well have been elaborated at greater length. The fact that this work is intended for a German audience sometimes leaves the American reader at a loss in giving Francke proper credit for pioneering in such areas as Bible societies, missions and other enduring international undertakings. The standard biography of Francke remains the two-volume work by Gustav Kramer (Halle, 1882). Much new material has since then been brought out, but a definitive biography of Francke remains a prime *desideratum*. Beyreuther himself has been bringing out important monographs on the ecumenical and other aspects of Francke's career, while Kurt Aland's *Die Annales Hallenses ecclesiastici* (1955) brings to light much material that has hitherto been buried in untouched archives. Others, like Friedrich Mahling, Carl Mirbt and August Nebe, honored the bicentennial of Francke's death (1927) with important monographs.

In our time the record of pietism, as well as of orthodoxy, needs to be set straight and amplified. Elements of both are active in evangelical Christianity today. Although Beyreuther's biography of Francke inclines at times to be laudatory and uncritical, it is nevertheless an excellent introduction. An English translation is being initiated.

E. THEODORE BACHMAN
*Pacific Lutheran Theological
Seminary,
Berkeley, California*

*Past Finding Out: the Tragic Story
of Joanna Southcott and Her Suc-
cessors.* By G. R. BALLEINE.
N. Y.: Macmillan Co., 1956. 151
pp. \$3.00.

This is an account of a strange chapter in the history of religious enthusiasm, filled with aberrations and eccentricities, peopled with men and women who lived on the outer boundary of sanity, and embracing two or three

outright charlatans. The story begins in 1792 with a housemaid of forty-two who began to hear voices calling her to be a prophetess, and the voices were accompanied by rappings and automatic writing. Joanna, the prophetess, gained her initial following from among the adherents of Richard Brothers who identified the British people with the Lost Tribes of Israel. Joanna believed herself to be the Bride of the Lamb, mentioned in Revelation 19; and in 1814, at the age of 64, she announced that she was to "bear a son by the power of the Most High." More than thirty doctors certified that she was pregnant, but as the months went by it finally became clear that she had been mistaken. "I did not in the least doubt," she confessed, and "now it all appears delusion." The shock destroyed her will to live and two months later she was dead.

One would expect that the movement would have faded away with Joanna's own disillusionment, but it did not. Many of her more ardent adherents were unable to accept the notion that she had been deluded, and rival theories were advanced to explain what had occurred. The movement splintered again and again as new keys to the mystery were put forward. The most prolific line of succession descended through the Turnerites, the Christian Israelites, and the New House of Israel to the New and Latter House of Israel which was founded in 1875 by James Jerushom Jezreel. The latter group fathered no less than six daughter sects—the most notorious of which was Benjamin Purnell's House of David. In addition to the definitely Southcottian groups, the whole movement is closely related to the British-Israel theory which was to gain numerous adherents of its own.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate Rochester Divinity School

New England Saints. By AUSTIN WARREN. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1956. 178 pp. \$3.75.

Mr. Warren establishes a very plausible category for the dissimilar

figures which he here selects from dissimilar periods of New England history, stretching from the beginnings to our own time. "Saints" are those "to whom reality was the spiritual life, whose spiritual integrity was their calling and vocation." Francis Greenwood Peabody in his older volume on Protestant saints lighted on other names such as those of Phillips Brooks and General Armstrong, founder of Hampton Institute. But Warren covers the whole period from the poets and parsons of the seventeenth century to Jack Wheelwright, our talented and unpredictable contemporary—with attention to Alcott and Emerson among the transcendentalists, to the influence of Fénelon on Unitarian and Quaker, to the elder James, Father Taylor, Charles Eliot Norton and Irving Babbitt.

The New Englander runs true to form. A poem of Wheelwright speaks of his "intellectual lust" but also of his drabness and of "life refused": he finds sin "beyond his means." There is the invaluable non-conformity and granite character. He is "firm and steadfast but ungracious." "In place of intuition or instinct, he trusts to calculation: he 'callates' (that is, calculates) his action." The author's figures dramatize rich talents and heroic traits but one may miss in his gallery some of the properly august dimensions of the tradition.

Yet the austere power of Puritanism turned negative and much of the interest of the present book lies in its show-case of individuals who sought in various ways to escape the incubus. Transcendentalists, quietists, pietists, Swedenborgians, humanists find their place here. Mr. Warren, in the scope and aim of the book, cannot give great attention to doctrine or to social factors or to biographical detail. His studies, however, are rich in suggestion and cumulatively present a significant story. Delectable traits of character, winsome aspects of piety, idiosyncrasy and versatility of expression in verse and rhetoric, unexpected richness of personal cultivation, disinterestedness of vocation: these things define the

genuine spirituality in view.

There is one doctrinal theme of particular interest that appears in the author's recurrent emphasis on and appreciation of a Platonic-mystical strain in his saints. The New Englander's "learning lies more readily in Platonism, or the Sacred Books of the East, or the Apocryphal gospels, than in the classical tradition." Further, on another page, "If Franklin represents one persistent kind of Yankee, there is . . . a rival succession—the succession exemplified by the sons of Plato and of Fénelon: President Edwards, Channing, Emerson, Upham—a line not yet ended nor (*me judice*) to be ended till the Lord's Kingdom comes . . .". Mr. Warren believes that neo-Platonism is enjoying a revival today. He is strong in his defense of Alcott and the elder Henry James. The difficulty is that the mystical if not vacuous strain in the New England tradition has some sorry cousins in various forms of new thought, mental cure, animal magnetism, Ralph Waldo Trine and Unity. This liking for an a-temporal, allegorical and gnostic ideal is understandable in view of the moralism and rigidity of the theological tradition. But the current is setting strongly today in Protestantism towards a recovery of the concrete and the historical dimensions of faith. Calvinism today at least in New England is disavowing its rigidities without denying its evangelical legacy. There is therefore room in it for many kinds of rebels who in another time might have been driven to theosophy or humanism.

AMOS N. WILDER

Harvard Divinity School

Zion on the Mississippi. The Settlement of the Saxon Lutherans in Missouri 1839-1841. By WALTER O. FORSTER. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953. 606 pp. \$4.00.

Behind today's far-flung and aggressive Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod lies a revealing and dramatic story of beginnings. While German free-thinkers in the St. Louis of 1839 might

sneer at them, the Saxon newcomers obviously had no way of knowing what they were getting into. Having left Germany largely for religious reasons, they wanted nothing so much as to be left alone. For they sought a spot in America where the frustrations they had known might be exchanged for a common life of social solidarity and spiritual concord. Their plans had been carefully laid. Their "codes" for emigration and for resettlement covered everything except the actualities of frontier life in America. And while they had sought to flee the dangers from without, they were—at least temporarily—unsuspecting of disillusioning corruption from within.

Those outside the fellowship of "Missouri" can now be as well informed about the beginnings of that body as are its most devoted adherents. Dr. Forster's meticulous and frank study is the knowledgeable retelling of a religiously motivated migration from Dresden and its environs to a New World utopia. Like other 19th-century utopias, even this Saxon Zion on the Mississippi (in Perry County) never became what the spellbinding leader, Pastor Martin Stephan, had hoped it might be. Conversely, it became much more than any of its more than 650 original partners would have dared to hope.

Having sketched the rise of "Stephanism" in Saxony up to 1837, Forster then launches into the story proper and fills it with a sometimes overwhelming amplitude of detail. He shows how the followers of Stephan became Lutheran separatists, how the idea of emigration took root among them, how plans were carefully laid and an emigration society organized; what hardships of parting and departing marked the start of the long journey via Bremen and New Orleans; how the Saxons fared upon their arrival, and how they sought to carry out their plans for communal living both in St. Louis and down the river in Perry County.

There were a multitude of mistakes, and there was some fantastic bungling. Finally, even Stephan himself,

exalted bishop of a never-never "Stephansburg," was expelled from the group. The charge was immorality, but there was probably also a good deal of dammed-up resentment against his arbitrary management that carried him to oblivion in Illinois. Thereupon the tightly knit fellowship, of which he had once been regarded as the indispensable and the "last remaining pillar of the true church," was subjected to torments of conscience and a painful searching of soul. In the process, a new leader emerged in the person of Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther. In place of the riverland utopia in Perry County, the real Zion on the Mississippi began to grow in St. Louis. Despite the change in leadership, the shift in polity from episcopacy to congregationalism, and the transition from pietism to orthodoxy, the solidarity of the group remained, being a remarkable fact to this day.

When Carl S. Mundinger's *Government in the Missouri Synod* was published in 1947 as the first offering of the Concordia Historical Society, the way was opened for the publication of further self-portraiture by bold Missourians who had gathered the facts and were done with official mythology. More than Mundinger's work, Forster's seems marked by a tongue-in-cheek humor and sometimes bitter touches of irony. Was it an altogether impious thought that, while reading this book, it occurred to me: What a scoop this story might have been for Gilbert and Sullivan! If this is fulsome praise for a one-time doctoral dissertation, still laden with over 2,000 erudite footnotes, then other thoughts are in order, too.

While Forster's presentation displays a commendable objectivity, the question arises as to the kind of objectivity one should seek in ecclesiastical historiography. Here I do not advocate a glossing over of facts that may be distasteful to partisans. Nor would I like to see an omission of valuable psychological and sociological insights that do very great service in making the emergence of a

group like the Stephanite Saxons plausible. Church historians in general, and Forster in particular, have gained much from the incisive studies of "Missouri" Lutheranism made by Heinrich H. Maurer and published in the 1920's in the *American Journal of Sociology*. Maurer's analysis and appraisal of such phenomena as "group consciousness," the laws of fellowship, and other matters, are still influential and profitable reading. But the question that disturbs me goes deeper. One could put it like this: To what extent is our American church historiography in danger of losing its theological relevance while achieving a certain secular acceptance? What, specifically, should be the proper place of *theology* in this epic of Zion on the Mississippi?

Theology, in Forster's brand of historiography, is not omitted. Rather, it is assumed. But being there by assumption also means that the implications of theology never get quite spelled out. What this means, among other things, is that church history, like its secular counterparts, may become flattened out and lose its theological significance. Thus, for example, more attention is paid to the German element in St. Louis who scoffed at the Saxons than to the piety and inner strength whereby these newcomers ultimately persevered. Nor does the treatment of contemporary religious forces in the new West, or the situation as it actually obtained among the already present Lutheran constituencies around 1840, receive sufficient treatment.

Finally, the thing that prompts these observations lies in the theology implicit in the story of the Saxons themselves. Nowhere in the history of Lutheranism in America do I know of a more dramatic expression and collective application of Luther's terse epigram about the Christian: He is *simul justus et peccator*. In these beginnings of "Missouri" Lutheranism we may be enlightened and even entertained, but we are, all of us, also revealed. And behind the revelation

risers the mercy, patience and majesty of God.

E. THEODORE BACHMANN
*Pacific Lutheran Theological
 Seminary*
Berkeley, Calif.

The Rungless Ladder. Harriet Beecher Stowe and New England Puritanism. By CHARLES H. FOSTER. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1954. xvii, 278 pp. \$4.50.

All the world knows, of course, the tremendous part *Uncle Tom's Cabin* played in transforming the vague anti-slavery sentiment of the North into crusading fury. Lincoln is supposed to have said to Mrs. Stowe that she caused the War. Social historians explain the book's effect by noting its adroitly combined appeal to the Protestant conscience and to the lush sentimentality of the period. They hold it up for study as "propaganda."

Few know much about Mrs. Stowe's other works, unless they have read in narratives of anti-slavery about her other piece of propaganda, *Dred*. So few have yet realized how the very fame of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* prevents us from recognizing a major American artist.

Mr. Foster's is the first serious endeavor to evaluate the whole expression, to study it in relation to all the forces, literary and cultural, that went into its making. Previous biographers, following the merely factual accounts by her family, have played up the picturesque, not to say the theatrical, conception of the doughty little woman, and so have fixed on our imagination a caricature of a period piece. Mr. Foster brings to his analysis a fine comprehension of the New England environment along with a literate grasp of the effect upon Lyman Beecher's daughter of such diverse influences as Byron, Madame de Staël, Wordsworth, and the political radicalism of Orestes Brownson. Also for the first time, he sensitively but surgically interprets the facts of her emotional biography — her twisted

relation to her family and to her husband, the traumatic effects of the deaths of her two children, and the agonies of her theological anxieties. He weaves these materials together to form a coherent portrait of a New England artist.

The world let her remain known only as the neurotic composer of an Abolitionist allegory mainly because after the Emancipation all that it assumed was left in the book was the melodrama and the tear-jerkings which for decades furnished the pabulum of the "Tom shows." Mr. Foster became excited by the discovery, beyond all this obfuscation, of an author of genius, and wrote his book, he says, out of eagerness to share this delight with others. He eminently succeeds. A writer with the power of Mrs. Stowe does not arise out of merely a social agitation. Mr. Foster's study is a contribution not alone to the cause of literary history but to the comprehension of our civilization.

He concludes that "the final claim for Harriet Beecher Stowe must rest on her ability to give us a balanced and immediate sense of the vital and complex past." He shows that her real masterpieces are *The Minister's Wooing* (1859) and *Oldtown Folks* (1869). Hence for readers of *Church History* Mr. Foster's work is a profound analysis of the Puritan tradition as it survived and flowered in the early nineteenth-century. By then this culture had indeed become complex, and in Harriet's intelligence it was both complex and vital. When he summarizes the really important meaning of her achievement, the works after *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *Dred*, he suggests that the artist in this New England — Emerson, Hawthorne, Emily Dickinson no less than Harriet — "found in Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Carlyle not so much insight as confirmation of assumptions inherited, often unconsciously, from Jonathan Edwards and even further back from seventeenth-century Puritanism."

Thus he gathers into one fascina-

ting focus a number of the basic strains in the spiritual heritage. He presents us with the pilgrimage of Harriet Beecher Stowe as a single and unique personality, but also as a highly representative dramatization of the religious experience of her America.

PERRY MILLER

Harvard University

History of the Christian Church in the West. By BARTON WARREN STONE. Lexington, Kentucky: The College of the Bible, 1956. With a Foreword by R. M. Pierson. vi, 53 pp. \$0.50.

This book comprises a reprinting under single cover of eight short chapters which appeared serially during 1827 in the *Christian Messenger*, edited by B. W. Stone, original issues of which are exceedingly scarce. The reprint is nicely done and is enhanced by pen sketches, one by R. B. Montgomery, President of the College of the Bible, and another by William Clayton Bower, whose years of retirement from a renowned career in religious education have been crowned by an effective sally into painting and drawing. This slight book therefore not only fills the need of making readily available its literary content. It is also an expression of latter-day appreciation for B. W. Stone's leadership through forty years of one part of the Christian Church movement.

It is unfortunate that Stone's chapters do not begin to comprise a history of the Christian Church movement, for that history is desperately needed. The volume does cover a few of the early and decisive events in the life of Stone and his colleagues which led to their withdrawal from Presbyterianism. Writing more than twenty years after the event, Stone was most concerned to describe briefly the doctrines preached in the Cane Ridge Revival, which became the point at issue in the dispute with synod. He tells also of a later interest in liberal views of the atonement and the trinity. Otherwise the report is colorless and shallow.

A few paragraphs tell of the defections from the movement caused by an incursion of Shakers into Kentucky, and the 1811 return to the Presbyterian church of some of the Christian Church preachers. The volume also includes a two page announcement reprinted from the *Christian Messenger* of January, 1832, of the union between Stone's followers and "the Reforming Baptists, (known *invidiously* by the name of Campbellites)" which brought into being the body now known as Disciples of Christ. Barton W. Stone is a very important figure in the history of American Christianity. He was a very meagre historian.

W. B. BLAKEMORE

Disciples Divinity House of the University of Chicago.

The Life of Matthew Simpson. By ROBERT D. CLARK. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956. xi, 344 pp. \$5.50.

The life of a man such as Bishop Simpson, whose origins were in the "grass roots" of Ohio, and who achieved influence in both the church and the political life of his time, cannot fail—especially when presented so capably and readably as here—to be of interest from several points of view.

The young Simpson felt—and by dint of determined striving, satisfied—the hunger for an education so prevalent among the more serious of the dwellers in the rural, even frontier, America of the early nineteenth century. Those farmers felt it was important to throw intellectual bridges across the geographical distance which separated them from the centres of culture, so, with the help of their denominations, they built colleges. In these colleges the sons of Greece were for the most part regarded as the allies, rather than the enemies of the sons of Zion, and it was important to recognize the difference between the Doric, Ionic and Corinthian orders as well as that between the various New Testament meanings of *baptizein*. It was but a step further to regarding geologists too as friends of Zion, and Simp-

son welcomed the light they threw on the methods of God's creation, as they disclosed the rocks "in their order of superposition." Simpson's educational career as student and as President of De Pauw was sufficiently typical to have value in the study of our cultural history.

Simpson's political interests began in a time when whether a man was a Methodist or a Presbyterian made a difference to the voters on election day, and grew through the stormy periods when he was the friend of Lincoln, Johnson, Grant and others. It would be wrong, however, and Mr. Clark does not try, to credit him with any considerable influence on national policy with regard to emancipation or anything else.

Prof. Clark is chairman of the Department of Speech in the University of Oregon, so it is not surprising that he pays a good deal of attention to Simpson's prowess as a preacher. By judicious selections from his more famous efforts, mingled with quick references to the effect he wrought on his hearers, the author gives us a vivid picture of the power of Simpson's oratory, more "elevated" in style than we care for today, but quite the thing a hundred years ago. Simpson could appeal to evangelical fervor and patriotic zeal with equal effect, and did so almost completely oblivious of any difference between the two.

The history of American Methodism is of course a large and essential ingredient in this biography. Simpson's first General Conference was the fateful one at New York City in 1844 at which the Methodists of the North and those of the South parted company. The exciting account of that Conference based on Simpson's own and others' comments is one of the best things in the book.

Bishop Simpson was moderate on the slavery issue before the War. "He believed that his first task was to preserve the church" (p. 213). But some innovations, whose adoption he thought essential to the good of Methodism, he championed vigorously. To his advocacy is due the beginning of

lay representation in the Conference. It was because he favored theological training for the preachers that the vigorous objections of Peter Cartwright to "velvet mouthed and downy D. D.'s" yielded among Methodists sufficiently to allow the establishment of seminaries west of New England.

Prof. Clark does not make the mistake of making his subject too much the hero; one catches an occasional note of irony and condescension, especially when he is describing the more intimate aspects of Simpson's piety. But his biography is a well written and just appreciation of the accomplishments of a man who was not too eminent to be representative, nor yet too much one of the crowd to be without interest and importance.

RICHARD CAMERON

Boston University.

The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel. By PAUL A. CARTER. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1956. 265 pp. \$3.75.

This is a book about the vicissitudes of the "social gospel" between the two world wars. Its general thesis is that the "social gospel" was under fire and in retreat from the end of the first World War to the beginnings of the great depression in 1929. During this decade the reforming interest and work of "the church" was channeled into the panacea of prohibition, and dissipated in the clash between modernist and fundamentalist. Meanwhile the clergy sank to a new low in the public esteem with consequent demoralization and loss of self respect which was abetted by the general prevalence of a "secularist spirit" and a "secularist mood" within the church (p. 94).

But meanwhile also, some American churchmen had discovered the universal church and the Ecumenical Movement, which pressed them to try to reconcile America's traditional "Life and Work" emphasis with Europe's emphasis on "Faith and Order." A doctrine of the Church seemed to be the universal solvent, and these churchmen presumed, for all their brethren, widely and publicly to repent of never

having had a doctrine of the Church in America. This, the author suggests, revolutionized "the old Social Gospel" by "bringing in the Church itself as a term of the discussion" of "social-ethical issues" (189).

Revival came with the Great Depression which, between 1929 and 1933, made radical social criticism palatable even in the middle class churches. The general impact of "the hundred days and afterward," including "Roosevelt's quickening influence" (167), gave socially minded churchmen a tangible cause, albeit at the risk of blurring lines between the social gospel and the New Deal, something which even Mr. Carter finds difficult to avoid. The whole situation was tinged with irony because as the world drifted toward World War II the church's social concern and gospel was more and more expressed in pacifism. Inevitably some within the churches protested the prevailing pacifism. Roosevelt's "Quarantine" speech created "a great schism in the Social Gospel" (208) which soon thereafter was divided between the foci represented by C. C. Morrison's *Christian Century* and Reinhold Niebuhr's *Christianity and Crisis* (215)—the latter representing what the author euphemistically refers to as "non-pacifism" or, in Niebuhr, as "anti-pacifism," rather than as "militancy." But, as Lincoln said four score years ago, "the war came," apparently with no appreciable hindrance from the one or boost from the other — a measure of the real status and influence of the parties in the churches.

Indeed, a primary motif of this work is that through all the vicissitudes of these tumultuous years, the influence of churchmen and their relevance to the issues of the day steadily declined. The contrast between the reception of the "Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike of 1919" and the statement of one hundred prominent churchmen on the Republic Steel Strike of 1937, demonstrates this (223-24). And, the author concludes, as this happened "the responsibility of the Social Gospel leaders toward the

church itself thereby became all the greater" (224) as they "had to fall back upon the Oxford Conference slogan, 'Let the Church be the Church'" (225). Churchmen of this mind could cherish the comforting thought that "the Christian witness would be manifested in the world even though the world rejected or paid little attention to the Church" and its "Social Gospel" (225).

There is something pathetic about this thesis that as the spokesmen for the visible churches obviously became less and less influential in America, churchmen tended to take refuge in a conception of the "witness" of "the Church" — especially since, as has been said often enough, the basic question in the modern world is, what and where is "the church"? Significantly, "the church" plays a prominent part in the argument of this book, but it is nowhere defined — and without such a definition what might be pathos easily slips over into bathos.

Methodologically the work is soundly based upon intensive and extensive study of denominational periodicals. Here the author followed the path marked out by Henry F. May (to whose *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* this work may be considered a sequel [p. 18]), confining his researches to the Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian denominations (p. 234, note 1). No doubt the periodical literature of these groups generally reflects a "middle class" outlook. But beyond this the author apparently supposes that "all . . . of the Protestant clergy, came from the . . . middle class walk of life" (p. 18), and hence that his coverage is complete.

Within the limits of this middle class outlook on American Protestantism, the work reflects the views of those who sometimes exude a faint pride in their freedom from socially conditioned bias, since for them, "all social absolutes [have been] melted in Niebuhr's dialectical acid" (p. 228). (It may sound paradoxical, but perhaps it is possible to absolutize a "relativistic critique of all social creeds" [p. 228]). Here, for the author, is defined the

great difference between the "old" and the "new" Social Gospels, since it is supposed that the "old" absolutized particular economic and social programs in somewhat simple-minded fashion (p. 228). This, while commonly enough assumed of late, would be a very difficult thing to demonstrate.

Where the author concludes that American Protestantism has come out is suggested by the closing comment that "the ministerial generation of the 50's and 60's" will be "the product of this Niebuhrian atmosphere" (230). But, the author intimates, "this Niebuhrian atmosphere" might better be called a "stratosphere" since he recognizes its "intellectual preciousness", that it is "primarily congenial to religious intellectuals", and that the real question is

Whether this 'new theology' and Social Gospel can be translated into a form which can be assimilated by the casual [perhaps lower class?] churchgoer without simplifying it into Fundamentalism... (230-31).

The historical error which lies back of this excessively "Niebuhrian" interpretation of recent developments is revealed in the assertion that "as all social absolutes melted in Niebuhr's dialectical acid, the transcendental absolutes of the neo-orthodox Continental theology flowed in to take their place" (228). The error is in supposing that only "the neo-orthodox Continental theology" could and did nourish the "ethical paradox of an activist relativism." For surely this is one of the most constant strains in American ideology as exemplified in practice. Lincoln, for example, enunciated and exemplified a theologically oriented "activist relativism." And what the author says of "Niebuhr and his followers," and what to him seems so new and different in America—might with equal appropriateness be said of Lincoln:

The same religious scruples which enjoined one from equating the Kingdom of God with any given social order nevertheless required one to become involved in the struggle (229).

Now Lincoln was neither the product nor the exemplar of a theological view characterized by "intellectual preciousness," and those in America who

wish to understand and adopt a position of "activist relativism" might well look to their own complex tradition—not exclusively—but as well as to Continental "neo-orthodoxy."

SIDNEY E. MEAD

Meadville Theological School
Chicago, Ill.

The Living of These Days: An Autobiography. By HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956. ix, 324 pp. \$4.00.

Autobiographies commonly fall into one of two categories: confessional (or introspective) and what for want of a better term may be called "public." Doctor Fosdick's is clearly of the latter sort. Drawing a curtain over his own inward wrestlings—for example, of his over-exposure to the glare of New York City in his seminary days he says "I have no intention of shadowing these recollections with a full account of that dreadful time"—he chooses rather to recount his participation in and reflection upon the great public issues which have stirred the Church during his lifetime. For Doctor Fosdick these have included the Fundamentalist controversy; the genesis and guidance of the Riverside Church; the reinterpretation of the homiletic art; the pacifist question; the development of psychologically-oriented pastoral counseling (the reader will note that this is not quite the same thing as the Positive Thinking of one of our contemporaries); and, finally, the coming and implications of neo-orthodox theology. This book is not an *I Confess*, much less a *J'Accuse*; it is, rather, a graceful and persuasive *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*.

The chapter "Winds of Doctrine" will be invaluable for the student of the contemporary history of ideas, for out of his long experience as minister and teacher Fosdick has written a firm but respectful dissent from neo-orthodoxy. He grants that the older liberalism "was sometimes carried to extremes," but denies that the clichés which currently describe that liberalism apply to most of the evangelical liberals whom he has known. He re-

minds us that his own college generation, lacking any native American intellectual Christian tradition, really had no choice in the matter; as of 1900 liberalism "offered to a generation of earnest youth the only chance they had to be honest while being Christian." And from his own published record out of the '20's and '30's he quotes some statements so at variance with what liberalism is usually assumed to have been that they will startle the young theologian who is prone to large generalizations about men and ideas.

PAUL A. CARTER

Montana State University

The Mysteries — Papers From the Eranos Yearbooks, Vol. 2. Edited by JOSEPH CAMPBELL. New York: Pantheon Books, 1955. 476 pp. \$5.00.

Very few people know of the Eranos meetings, which have been held every Summer since 1933 at Ascona, Switzerland, under the sponsorship of Frau Olga Froebe-Kaptein. The term "eranos" means the "shared feast," signifying the sharing of ideas by historians, psychologists, anthropologists, theologians and philosophers. The translation of the *Eranos-Jahrbücher* into English began in 1954 with the volume *Spirit and Nature*. The present book is the second of these English translations. Included in this volume are eight articles from the 1944 meetings, two from 1939, and one each from 1941 and 1942. Many of the articles, important as they are, are outside the concern of *Church History*. Readers will find C. G. Jung's article, "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass," suggestive and controversial.

Probably the most important article contained in this volume, at least for church historians, is "The Christian Mystery and the Pagan Mysteries" by Hugo Rahner, S. J., professor of Church History at the University of Innsbruck. His article is divided in-

to three parts. In the first section, Father Rahner discusses the views of three groups of authors concerning the relation between the Christian mystery and the Ancient Mysteries. "The first group insisted on an actual relation of dependency between the ancient mysteries and nascent Christianity, particularly the theology of St. Paul" (p. 340). To this group belong Hermann Usener, Albert Dieterich, Richard Reitzenstein, Wilhelm Bousset and Alfred Loisy. The second group is exemplified by the monks of Maria Laach who developed the so-called *Mysterienlehre* (mystery theory). While they rejected the theories of generic dependence, they found a common factor in the "cult *eidōs*" between the ancient mysteries and the Christian mystery. The third group of scholars drew a clear distinction between dependence in the generic sense and the dependence of "adaptation" (p. 343). Rahner feels that "this group of scholars had done greater justice than the others to the essence of both terms of the comparison: they do not reduce Christianity to a common level in order to prove that it is a generic or at least a phenomenological outgrowth of the mysteries; but neither do they fall into the trap of implicitly Christianizing the ancient mysteries" (*Ibid.*). In the second and third sections of the article, Rahner gives a brilliant analysis of the early Christian conception of mystery by examining the mysteries of the Cross and of Baptism.

Readers will also enjoy reading Max Pulver's "Jesus' Round Dance and Crucifixion According to the Acts of St. John," Hans Leisegang's "The Mystery of the Serpent," and Julius Baum's "Symbolic Representations of the Eucharist." Whether or not one agrees with the various authors, the Eranos papers live up to the motto of a "shared feast" of ideas.

JOSEPH M KITAGAWA

Federated Theological Faculty
University of Chicago

Europe's most widely-discussed
contemporary theologian writes on

THE PRESENCE OF ETERNITY **History and Eschatology**

by **RUDOLF BULTMANN**

In the famous Gifford Lectures, one of Europe's most famous theologians explores the meaning of history. Professor Bultmann considers how far, and with what results, the attitudes of European thinkers have diverged from the New Testament concepts. He then presents his own matured ideas on the nature of history. An exciting survey of the thought of the great philosophers who have dealt with the subject, **THE PRESENCE OF ETERNITY** also brilliantly restates the valuable insights of Christian eschatology which are in danger of being either completely secularized or ignored.

THE PRESENCE OF ETERNITY is an impressive work in which the thought of one of the leading theological minds of our day is fully revealed.

At your bookseller \$3.00.

HARPER & BROTHERS, N. Y. 16

THE QUEST AND CHARACTER OF A UNITED CHURCH

Winfred E. Garrison

"A new and striking approach to the whole problem . . . [Dr. Garrison] concludes that the real task is not to resolve the differences of conviction and practice but to secure a recognition of their continuing validity within a united Church . . . This is an approach to Christian unity which calls for much more attention than it has received." — Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, Executive Secretary in the U. S. World Council of Churches. \$3.50.

Visit your bookstore soon.

THE WAY TO BIBLICAL PREACHING

Winifred G. Miller

Renewed concern for theology has brought with it a deepened understanding of the Bible and a fresh appreciation of the essentially biblical character of Christianity.

THE WAY TO BIBLICAL PREACHING

relates these modern currents of religious thinking to the minister's weekly preparation of sermons. All those who seek to preach the Word will find their minds stimulated and their ministry enriched by this book. \$3.50.

Washington
The National Book Company

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

The King's Speeches

A Study in Middle English Literature

By ARTHUR H. KAN-

A detailed study of the "King's Speeches" — the formal addresses of the early fifteenth century — as developed by the English monarchs. The author presents a systematic and thorough treatment of the literary problems posed by this material, and links the Middle English period with the Renaissance by placing the context in its proper historical and intellectual thought. From the early studies of the fifteenth century to the modern theories of the development of political thought, the author gives a new interpretation of a period in the history of English literature.

540 pages, \$10.00

French Catholicism and the French Revolution

A Study of Church and State, Clergy and Religion, 1682-1802

By SUZETTE C. FOLAND

A study of the Catholic Church in France from the reign of Louis XIV to the Revolution, with the main emphasis on the period of the French Revolution. The author discusses the influence of the political character of the French Revolution, the attitude of the Catholic Church, the religious revival of the French Church in the Eighteenth century, and the effect of the Revolution on the Catholic belief and practice.

240 pages, \$5.00

Order from your bookseller or

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

Princeton, New Jersey